

VOLUME 28

NUMBER 5

Property of
Graduate Theological Union
JUN 4 1987

Christian Order

Summary of Contents for May, 1987

SYNOD, CATECHISM AND DEPOSIT
OF FAITH

Mgr. Eugene Kevane

NEXT YEAR IN ST. PETERSBURG

John Biggs-Davison, M.P.

POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY AND
MODERN RELIGION

James V. Schall, S.J.

LIGHT FROM HEAVEN

Edith Myers

EVOLUTION IN THE CHURCH : 2

The Editor

THE INCREASINGLY IMMINENT
THREAT OF COMMUNISM

Hamish Fraser

THE MAKING OF A NEW
CENTRIFUGAL CHURCH

Michael Gilchrist

THANK YOU

I would like to take this opportunity of thanking all those who have renewed their subscriptions to *Christian Order* so promptly and so generously during past months. May I ask any of you whose subscriptions are still outstanding to be so kind as to renew them without delay. I would be very grateful indeed if you would do this. Thank you for your support.

— *Paul Crane, S.J.*

Contents

Page	
258	LAMENT FOR A LADY <i>The Editor</i>
260	THE MAKING OF A NEW CENTRIFUGAL CHURCH <i>Michael Gilchrist</i>
269	LIGHT FROM HEAVEN <i>Edith Myers</i>
275	SYNOD, CATECHISM AND DEPOSIT OF FAITH <i>Mgr. Eugene Kevane</i>
287	NEXT YEAR IN ST. PETERSBURG <i>John Biggs-Davison, M.P.</i>
290	REVOLUTION IN THE CHURCH: 2 <i>The Editor</i>
299	POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY AND MODERN RELIGION <i>James V. Schall, S.J.</i>
305	THE INCREASINGLY IMMINENT MENACE OF COMMUNISM <i>Hamish Fraser</i>
314	THE VATICAN INSTRUCTION ON LIBERATION: 3 <i>W. G. Smith, S.J.</i>
319	BOOK REVIEW <i>Paul Crane, S.J.</i>

If You Change Your Address :

Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you.

Christian Order is a magazine devoted to Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields. It is published ten times a year.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Rd., London S.W.1V, 2BG. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

Christian Order is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £5 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$10.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

Air-mail rates as follows :
U.S.A., Canada
India, etc.—£10, \$20
Australia—£12, \$25
New Zealand—£12, \$25

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 28

MAY

NO. 5

Lament for a Lady

THE EDITOR

I AM thinking of a very special lady; none other than her whom English Catholics love to call Our Lady, and to whom their Anglican counterparts refer somewhat archly as "The Virgin". This I have never liked.

The lament is called for by way of a mixture of protest and sorrow at the way Our Lady has been treated by progressive, so-called renewalists within the Catholic Church for the last twenty years. Interpreting openness to the world in terms of assimilation to it, up-dating in terms of discarding, these have sought to erase those differences, which they think of as no more than cosmetic and which, in this country particularly, distinguished Catholic devotions from those of the Anglican Church. Chief among these, it seems to me, are those which so rightly surround Our Lady. I know of no great Anglican devotion to her. The Anglican Church, man-made—has never taken God's Mother to its heart. She remains "The Virgin". For us Catholics she is Our Lady, the Virgin-Mother of God. It is and always will be that way in millions of Catholic hearts, despite the unwanted and insensitive efforts of progressive clerics and religious to downgrade her.

So it is that you get boys and girls coming out of so-called Catholic Schools, often not knowing what a Rosary is or how to say it; with the "Memorare" or the "Hail Holy Queen" never on their lips because they have never been taught how to say either of these lovely prayers. No more have they been shown and/or encouraged to light a candle in front of Our Lady's statue; and, anyway, there would

appear to be little point in teaching them because, in so many instances, candles and candleabra have been carted away. Worse still, in not a few cases, the statue itself of Our Lady, has suffered a similar fate. "Carted", perhaps, would be too strong a word in this context. Let us say it has been moved to one side, away from the "over-prominent" position it occupied before. But what would you think of anyone who expressed a desire to retire his own mother to a "decent obscurity"; in other words, to keep her out of the way.

What always hits me hard; sends a pang through my heart as my mind goes racing back over the years, is February 11th, the Feast of Our Lady of Lourdes. It has been downgraded now to the status of an "optional commemoration", with only the opening Collect to itself and the rest of the Mass drawn from the Common of Masses of Our Lady. So, there's nothing special about the Feast now; nothing, that is, so far as the liturgical reformers and renewalists of today are concerned. Nothing, in fact, about Lourdes, despite the fact that the Faithful, not only of this, but of so many other countries are flocking to Lourdes these days in greater numbers than ever. This, despite the unfeeling attitude of some of the clerics in charge of what is undoubtedly one of the greatest shrines of Christendom. So far, thank God, they appear to have laid hands on little that is precious at Lourdes. In all probability, they are scared to do so because of what they imagine, rightly enough, the Faithful would do to them. I only hope to God it stays that way; that the Faithful see to it that it does so, and endorse their resolution in this regard by going on pilgrimage to Lourdes in greater and greater numbers every year.

Meanwhile, let all of us, especially those who cannot get to Lourdes, take note, please, that the Rosary Crusade, which last year brought 10,000 good Catholics and true out onto the London streets in praise of the Mother of God and their Mother, will take place again this year in May. Hopefully, this time, there will be 20,000 Catholics out on the streets. And why not? It is the least we can do to make up for the insults and the slights thrown at Our Lady by progressive priests and religious—to the dismay and sorrow of the Faithful—during the past 20 years.

Mr. Michael Gilchrist is Lecturer in history and politics at the Institute of Catholic Education, Ballarat, Australia. The father of four sons, he has taught at Catholic high schools and teachers' colleges for 25 years. He has contributed numerous articles to secular and religious journals and newspapers and written several books, including *Daniel Mannix: Priest and Patriot* (Dove, 1982). In the fall of 1986 he published *Rome or the Bush* which has already been warmly commended to readers of *Christian Order*.

The Making of a Centrifugal New Church

MICHAEL GILCHRIST

“CENTRIFUGAL” (meaning “to fly from the center”), is a characteristic rather common in the Catholic Church today, especially in parts of the Western world. However, given the fundamental importance for Catholicism of fidelity to the papacy and magisterium, it is misleading, even a contradiction in terms, to describe centrifugal tendencies within the Church as “radical” or “progressive”. A more apt label for these tendencies, which does not presume to identify them specifically as heresy, modernism, neomodernism, secular humanism, Protestantism or indiscipline, is an umbrella concept such as “*New Church*”.

As a fellow-countryman, Fr. Peter Elliott, argued in a recent *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* article, “Towards the Centre” (October 1985), it is time that Catholics loyal to the papacy cast off the labels of “conservative”, “right-wing” or “traditional” and claimed their rightful position in the Center with the Pope and magisterium. It is time also that the labels “progressive”, “radical” and “liberal” were denied to those who refuse to accept and defend basic teachings of Catholicism. (In more extreme cases some

dissenters scarcely could be described as Christians at all, let alone "liberal" Catholics, e.g., Hans Küng.)

It is understandable, of course, that those presently enjoying reputations for "risk-taking", "boldness" and "creativity" on Catholic lecture circuits prefer not to take their centrifugal opinions out of the Church where they belong since protestant, Marxist, secular humanist or agnostic audiences would find their dissent unremarkable, even old-hat. But, as long as Catholics accept a newchurch agenda for "renewal" and post-conciliar "pluralism", such dissenters will continue to wear the false label of "progressive Catholicism".

It is urgent that the words of Christ, "He who is not with me is against me", be reaffirmed and that a contradictory situation within the Church be soon remedied.

The words of Pope John Paul II about world peace, aid for needy peoples or enlarged roles for the laity are widely applauded. But the Pope's teachings and instructions contained in such documents as *Catechesi Tradendae*, *Familiaris Consortio* or *Inaestimabile Donum* are all too often ignored, rejected or disobeyed. Such behavior cannot be described as radical or liberal when it departs from papal authority as this affects the good of the universal Church; it is a further manifestation of the newchurch mentality.

A "new class" prizes power

Those who propagate newchurch tendencies are a *new class* of religious professionals who prize their power and influence at the local level above that of the magisterium. This new class, along with its supporters and fellow travelers, has come to dominate major sectors of influence within the Church in most western nations especially. These sectors include religious congregations, universities and colleges, education offices, justice and peace bodies and seminaries. The newchurch ideology within the latter draws its inspiration less from the content of Vatican II's documents than from their "spirit", less from the Church's Center than from a parallel magisterium of speculative theologians, scripture scholars, behavioural scientists and modern educationalists. These tendencies which the new class fosters are not renewal at all, but pseudo-renewal, because they fly from the Catholic Center.

Today, a revolution by stealth proceeds within the Church, gradually replacing the "real thing" with foreign ingredients. In the meantime the Church's Catholic remnants are subjected to varying combinations of pop psychology, secular humanism, neo-Marxism, "pseudo-sex" and situation ethics in countless contexts. The New Church is evident in countless liturgical abuses, defective, weak catechetical programs, adult education courses, parish "renewal" booklets and in the thrust of a host of lectures and publications. These centrifugal, unCatholic tendencies have prevailed in much of the Western world, notably in the Netherlands, the United States and Canada, but also, regrettably, in Australia

Newchurch ideas, of course, are mostly far from new, being in many cases a recycling of that Modernism condemned by Pope St. Pius X in *Pascendi*. But the excitement, expectation and publicity surrounding the events of Vatican II gave these discredited ideas a fresh lease of life so that they intertwined confusingly with the genuinely renewing tendencies in the Church. Ideas once confined to small circles of adventurous scholars now gained a huge forum with the world's mass media anxious to support the most *avant garde* ideas as the wave of the future for an unravelling Catholicism. Some Catholics, growing restless at their Church's "hard" teachings, were especially receptive to the protest of softened (or abandoned) doctrines and disciplines: with the onset of vernacular liturgies, eased rules for fasting, and enthusiasm for ecumenism large numbers assumed that relaxed stances on the Pill, Sunday Mass obligation and "irrelevant" teachings were only a matter of time. The vague wording in some conciliar documents along with expressions such as "signs of the times", "we are church", and "pilgrim people" offered endless scope for some of the religious professionals charged with interpreting and implementing Vatican II.

From the 1960s onwards Catholics in Europe, North America, and Australia would be subjected to hosts of visiting speakers, seminars, in-service days, work-shops, updating courses and new publications all claiming to be vital ingredients of post-conciliar reform; sifting Catholic wheat from newchurch chaff would be beyond many ordin-

ary Catholics who were accustomed to trust whatever appeared as "official" in their Church. Religious congregations and educational establishments would prove especially receptive to newchurch ideas, even if these were based more on the secular world's fashionable writings than on the Catholicism reaffirmed in the Council documents.

Sifting the wheat from the chaff

In many countries bishops entrusted key offices, carrying great power (including the expenditure of vast sums of money) and influences, to the new class religious professionals. Some bishops, understandably, were caught off balance by the rapidity of events but wanted to seem progressive and up-to-date and hence tended to favor the go-getters, the more innovative-looking personnel who had attended the right course at the right colleges and universities and who now could "drop" the right names. Perhaps they viewed staunch, "papist" Catholics as reactionary reminders of a seemingly discredited pre-Vatican II era. Whatever the reasons, the Church in the West was to experience, as Christopher Derrick put it, "revolutionary orthodoxy" as the new party line with "the underground movement" now "the regime in power".

Those newchurch-oriented priests and religious who did not renounce their vocations in the heady era of the late 1960s and early 1970s gradually would bring the excitement and expectation of the period, along with the protests against *Humanae Vitae* or their involvement in anti-Vietnam War demonstrations, into expanding Church bureaucracies as the new conventional wisdom. Over the past fifteen to twenty years they have helped establish and perpetuate (along with like-minded lay elites) the basis of a newchurch ideology which predominates in so many Church bodies in the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia and elsewhere.

It is not surprising that many of these professionals have reacted with ill-disguised hostility to the Catholicism of Pope John Paul II, Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger and other representatives of the Center.

An examination of the newchurch ideology reveals a number of facets which, despite claims to the contrary, are

inconsistent with the renewal called for by Pope John XXIII and reaffirmed by Pope John Paul II.

Firstly, some elements of the New Church tend to be indifferent to or hostile towards any stress on the sacred or the supernatural, despite occasional lip-service to "God" or "the Spirit" (rarely the Holy Spirit). They act, in practice, as if these had little practical relevance in a renewed Church. This *horizontalism* is very evident in much of the life-situation catechetics (which manages to eliminate most distinctive Catholic doctrines), in "meaningful" liturgies and in efforts to politicize the Church in areas of justice and peace. The New Church is likewise man-centered and worldly, more anxious to make Catholicism acceptable in the secular world than to evangelize this world.

Masses celebrated at a "Peace and Justice" seminar in Australia, for example, were sited in a university college common room, despite the availability of a large chapel. The priest involved built an "altar" of desk drawers, using ordinary supermarket sliced bread for the Eucharist, wearing no vestments and introducing a John Lennon song as an entrance hymn. In other instances Catholic high school students spend religious periods analyzing the words of pop songs by Michael Jackson or Joni Mitchell. (When I questioned my class at a Catholic teachers' college about their experience of thirteen years of Catholic education not one student recalled any contact with Catholic history or the documents of Vatican II).

Secondly, the New Church is disdainful of Church authority (save what its own new class can wield at the local level), especially that of the Pope and his trusted advisers in Rome. There are token nods towards the papacy or the occasional vague, supportive line from the encyclical to provide window dressing for unCatholic programs. But despite Vatican II's strong affirmation of papal primacy (*Lumen Gentium*, 22), the New Church prefers to stress collegiality as a basis for locally independent churches or "basic Christian communities". In the name of church democracy it is claimed that these grass-roots bodies should be liberated from Roman centralism to develop their home-grown forms of "Catholicism".

Push for a "Brave New Church"

Much emphasis is placed on "consultations" with diocesan discussion groups (usually over-representative of newchurch activists). Few of those involved take note of the Center's well-documented stances as they speculate earnestly about a "Brave New Church" of the future. While papal infallibility, if it is mentioned at all, is held to be very limited in scope, there seems no limit to the deference accorded a parallel magisterium of pop psychologists, trendy theologians or speculative scripture scholars.

Thirdly, the New Church questions, weakens or ignores the distinctive Catholic focus on divinely revealed truths, guarded, interpreted and transmitted by a magisterium, at the Center. There is continual demand for "academic freedom" by those who seek larger audiences for their un-Catholic pluralist excesses. Others insist on the prior rights of untrammelled conscience or the pooled experiences of discussion groups as relevant bases for "truth". Catholics, it is now alleged, can be Catholics on almost any terms, regardless of what the Center defines as Catholic.

Another attack on Catholic acceptance of permanent, objective truths has come via an embracing of the secular world's cult of change and the evolutionism of Darwin and Teilhard de Chardin. The Vatican II goal of spiritual renewal through a deepened understanding and appreciation of the truths of faith has been distorted to require the adapting of firmly-held doctrines in line with secular notions of progress. There is a horror of the "same old thing", an aversion towards anything "static" or "stagnant". The Church is expected to be constantly open to the latest insights of the secular world, to bend the knee before fashionable opinions on "equality", "discrimination" or "wholeness".

One Australian diocesan Lenten discussion program included an endorsement of active homosexual relationships, despite what *Personae Humanae* had to say about such activities, while an author of this program was later appointed Rector of one of the country's largest diocesan seminaries. The Vice-Rector of one of these seminaries was heard to declare that only, "liberal, pluralistic, tolerant, broad-minded and forward-thinking guys" would be

allowed to ordination if he had his way. (Seminarians unwise enough to betray "papist" loyalties can be declared psychologically unsuitable for the priesthood and obliged to terminate or defer their courses.)

Not long ago one catechetics journal declared that "experience" should be "honoured over doctrine" and that only those doctrines with "experiential validity" belonged in school courses. Such a view is widely held in western catechetical circles despite the manifest instructions of *Catechesi Tradendae*, but, then, the words of Jean Piaget or Lawrence Kohlberg often carry more weight among the professionals than those of Pope John Paul II. Under the circumstances it is not surprising that so many young Catholics are illiterate in their faith, even those exposed to thirteen years in Catholic schools. Few Catholic truths can be taught in purely experiential terms, save in a watered-down form, e.g., the Assumption, the Immaculate Conception, the Trinity, papal infallibility, the ministerial priesthood, original sin, the Real Presence, for example.

At the adult level, parish discussion groups (based on so-called renewal programs) seem concerned less about enlarging knowledge and deepening understanding of the faith than on sharing and affirming individual feelings and experiences. If the latter exercise should lead to unCatholic contradictions, "facilitators" are advised not to invoke official Church teachings. The impression often conveyed is that Catholic truth is relative to the individual, the discussion group or the local church community. Catholicism, in other words, can become whatever these people choose to make it. Writing in a magazine a few years ago a new-church nun said it all:

Society has lost much of its structure, moral boundaries are changing rapidly and, as theologians investigate a more personalized morality, this trend will develop and continue. We must no longer rely on structures or legal paraphernalia but on ourselves; this, of course, is the emphasis of the new moral theology. There must be personal, individual growth.

Catholics who question the confident "musts" of the New Church and point to recent Vatican documents or papal statements are likely to be told that they are "legalistic",

"fundamentalist", "rigid" or "narrow" and to be reminded that "everything has changed since Vatican II" (on the basis of a throw-away line or two from the Council documents). Few Catholics at seminars, meetings, conferences or seminaries (most seemingly enjoying the blessing of the official Church) are aware of what is taking place. The majority of those exposed to such indoctrination tend to accept the newchurch version of Catholic renewal along with its view that open fidelity to the Church's Center is for "conservatives" or "reactionaries".

Another feature of the New Church is its evident elitism, an elitism which posits that only those with "mature", "autonomous" or "committed" thought patterns are worthy of church membership. The "passive", "obedient" or habit-bound Catholic must be straightened out by adult education or renewal courses. The New Church must be a church of quality (not mere numbers) and those unable to survive in the absence of clear rules, doctrines and accepted authority are no loss. (They are expected to reach Kohlberg's Stage Five, at least, to qualify.)

Ultimately, according to the newchurch agenda, a smaller church must emerge with an elect membership, rather like a religious order, one able to interpret and to adapt according to changing times and places so that the local New Church is ever meaningful and acceptable in the contemporary world. Members of one Australian newchurch parish, for example, wrote to a diocesan newspaper in praise of the enlightened ministry of their pastor who, they said, had confronted them "with the childishness of some of our beliefs, that we might have a mature faith". This new priest, they continued, "tears down facades, and removes props, that we might rely on inner strength". The result, we were informed, was "a more mature, self-sustaining and developing Christianity". In reality, it is doubtful whether this "mature faith" constituted even minimal Christianity, let alone Catholicism, given that it questioned such teachings as papal infallibility, the divinity of Christ, the Trinity, the Immaculate Conception and the Real Presence. (Appropriately enough, the Creed was omitted at this parish's Sunday Masses).

It is difficult to determine with precision how far the newchurch process has spread within the Catholic Church. That it has made considerable inroads is evident from the contents of many so-called Catholic publications which show distinct centrifugal tendencies. For example, varying doses of the New Church are identifiable in catechetical publications, adult education courses, parish renewal booklets and seminary lectures. Barring decisive, courageous action by a larger proportion of the bishops and those responsible to them, the Church may continue to be quietly sabotaged from within. The fact that Jesus promised to be with his Church "all days, even unto the consummation of the world" did not guarantee that all sections of the universal Church would survive the challenges of fidelity or renewal throughout the centuries. Unfortunately, for the future of the Church in certain parts of the world, many sincere, well-intentioned bishops, priests, religious and laity accept the subversive newchurch process as if it were a part of the post-Vatican II renewal, despite the recent warnings in *The Ratzinger Report*.

Catholics in the United States, Australia and elsewhere must, therefore, as Fr. Peter Elliott reminded us, reject the agenda of the so-called progressives and claim a rightful place in the Church's Center, along with the Pope and the magisterium. The legitimacy of those who "fly from the Center" must be persistently denied and those false labels such as "traditional", "reactionary" or "conservative" for Catholics faithful to the Center eliminated from popular usage.

STRAW IN THE WIND ?

From a Parish Newsletter

Holy Communion

For practical reasons, from next Sunday we will return to the old practice of receiving Holy Communion along the altar rails. If you cannot kneel, just stand. Those who prefer a procession can continue to receive Holy Communion at the Lady Altar.

The story of Our Lady of Guadalupe will be known to many readers. Perhaps, not so many will know the background against which it is set. It is sketched out here by the well-known American Catholic Journalist, Edith Myers. Acknowledgements and thanks to *The Wanderer*.

Light from Heaven

(OUR LADY OF GUADALUPE)

EDITH MYERS

CATHOLICS are generally aware of the fact that our Lady's appearances in Mexico in the 16th century produced a great number of conversions among the Indians. But it is less well known what conditions prevailed in that part of the world before the arrival of the Spanish, and before the apparitions. It is seldom if ever that a supernatural intervention has so rapidly changed the whole face of a country.

Bishop Schlarman, in *Mexico: A Land of Volcanoes*, gives us this picture. In 1487, the emperor of the Aztecs completed and dedicated a great temple in Tenochtitlan (later Mexico City). The dedication was celebrated by the sacrifice of somewhere between 20,000 and 72,000 victims. Worship of a vengeful and terrifying god ruled the lives of the Aztecs, who had gained ascendancy over the other tribes of Indians in Mexico. War with other tribes provided some of the victims for sacrifice. Others were captured or bought from slave hunters. Others were demanded as fines for failure to pay tribute. Children were not infrequently victims.

There was a caste system with definite social classes: the nobles, the priests, the artisans, the merchants, the tillers of the soil, and the slaves. All were subject to military service. The land belonged only to the emperor and the nobles. Most of the people were bound to the soil and were poorly housed and fed. The nobles were polygamous, and the wealthy classes had slaves.

Sacrifices, in the Aztec temples, were conducted in this manner. On a waist-high table, the victim was stretched out on his back, his chest slashed open, and his heart torn out while he was still alive. There were many lesser temples besides the great one at Tenochtitlan.

The Aztecs had some remarkable skills. They had constructed fine bridges and causeways, and great palaces; they worked in gold and silver; they had devised a very accurate calendar. Montezuma, the emperor at the time of the arrival of the Spaniards, lived in a palace with 100 rooms and a like number of baths. The walls were covered with marble and other stones; the ceilings were of costly wood, richly carved, and the floors were carpeted. At the same time, in a country rich in natural resources, the majority of the Indians lived rather poorly. They had no draft animals; no horses, cows, burrow, goats, sheep, or chickens. They had no potatoes or peanuts or dates or bananas or grain such as wheat. Their chief diet was corn and frijoles. They made pulque from maguey. They made cloth woven from cotton and from the fibers of the maguey. Transportation was on the backs of men.

Explaining the Christian Religion

Cortez landed in Mexico on Good Friday, 1519. He named the place where he landed Villa Rica de Vera Cruz. According to Bernal Diaz, one of his soldiers, who kept a detailed journal, Cortez was, in spite of some moral faults, very devout and prayed every morning with a book of hours, and heard Mass with devotion.

The Spaniards were regarded as liberators by the subject tribes of Mexico, and as they marched toward Mexico City, members of these tribes, who feared the Tyrannical rule of the Aztecs, joined them.

Whatever mistakes the Spanish made, or whatever bad men they had among them — and it is inevitable that there will be bad men in any army — the Spaniards were concerned with saving the souls of the Indians, and they endeavoured to teach them the Gospel. The rulers of Catholic countries in the 16th century really believed they had an obligation to bring the Faith to the people in the newly discovered regions.

When Cortez met Montezuma, he attempted, through interpreters, to explain the Christian religion to him. But Montezuma, conditioned by a religion whose gods demanded human sacrifice, did not respond. At Cortez's request, Montezuma took him to the temple where human sacrifices were in progress. Bernal Diaz says it was like a slaughterhouse. Despite the protests of the Spaniards, the sacrifices continued

Cortez had arrived in Mexico in 1519, and in 1521 the Aztec empire was overthrown.

One of Cortez's first moves was to ask for missionaries to be sent to teach the natives the Christian religion. The Franciscans were the first to come. They arrived in Mexico in 1524. When they came in sight, Hernan Cortez and his entourage went out to meet them, and the Indians were astonished to see the commander, followed by his soldiers, kneel before the bedraggled, humbly dressed friars and kiss the hem of their garments.

The Franciscans were followed by Dominicans and Augustinians. They worked hard at teaching the people the Faith and at inculcating justice and charity. It was no small task to do this with people who believed in a god who demanded that they sacrifice not only their enemies and their slaves, but sometimes their own children. It meant a complete break with the customs that had held sway in New Spain.

To teach the Indians, the missionaries had to learn the native languages. They compiled dictionaries and wrote books in the various tongues that were spoken in the country, the majority of them in Nahuatl.

Cortez appointed Indians to govern new towns and the towns had friaries where children were taught not only religion, but the rudiments of secular learning. Spaniards who were put in charge of Indians were to be responsible for their conversion and Christian manner of living, and were to be leaders in the development of the country. Cortez imported wheat, barley, rice, almond trees, goats, horses, cows, hogs, and medicines, buying some of these with his own money.

The Restoration of Christianity

There was a sharp setback in the conversion of the Indians with the appointment of the First Audiencia in

1528. The Audiencia, a governing body of several men, was probably a good idea, but the persons in it were wrong. They were cruel and unscrupulous, the worst among them being Nuno de Guzman. They treated the Indians terribly, reducing some of them to a slavery as bad as that from which they had been rescued. The rule of the First Audiencia was brought to an end by two things. Bishop Zumarraga, Bishop-elect of New Spain, smuggled a letter to the emperor in Spain apprizing him of what was going on, and Cortez went back to Spain himself, to make a personal report. The men of the First Audiencia were tried by a Second Audiencia, made up of conscientious men, under the leadership of Don Vasco de Quiroga, and its members were sent back to Spain for punishment. The Second Audiencia, appointed in 1530, re-established peace and order.

Don Vasco de Quiroga, who headed this body, was something of a missionary himself, and worked hard at the restoration of Christianity which had suffered from the cruelty of the First Audiencia. He corrected the abuses against the Indians and brought many back to the Faith. He established two hospitals which were houses of hospitality to take in strangers and travellers, widows and orphans. Spanish teachers were sent to teach new skills to the Indian artisans.

Don Vasco eventually became a priest and then a Bishop of Michoacan, where he had established one of his hospitals. At the age of 95, he set out on a Confirmation tour, and in the course of the tour he died. He left nothing at all of his own, although he had come to Mexico a man of means. He had devoted his own resources to charity and to the betterment of the Indians.

Through all the difficulties, the missionaries continued their work. They constructed churches and schools, and the Indians who were converted seem to have been thoroughly converted. People who find it too difficult to drive a few miles for Confession might be surprised to learn that the Christianized Indians sometimes walked distances of 60 or 80 miles to find a confessor. Many of them were willing to risk their lives to bring the Faith to more people. Fr. Toribio de Motolinia wrote of their piety, devotion, and Christian integrity.

Only a few years after the conquest, priests were teaching Latin grammar to some of the young boys. Bishop Zumaraga wrote with pride that he had 60 boys already grammarians "who know more grammar than myself". He reported in June, 1531 :

"Each convent of the friars has a building adjoining it for teaching the boys; this building contains a school, dormitory, refectory and chapel. The young men are very humble and docile to the religious and love to be with the fathers. They are chaste, quite intelligent, and very skillful in the art of building. Among all the friars who know the language of the Indians the most perfect is Friar Peter of Ghent, a religious lay brother, who has a very elegant understanding of it and has in his care more than 600 young men."

The work of the missionaries had clearly borne much fruit. But there were still millions of Indians who, steeped in the pagan religion in which they had been reared, resisted the teaching of the priests. Later on in that same year, 1531, the missionaries received unexpected help from Heaven. Our Lady appeared to one of the Indian converts, Juan Diego, and left her miraculous image on his tilma. This broke down the resistance of most of the Indians to the Christian religion and ended their attachment to the pagan gods. The Mother of the True God of whom the missionaries had been telling them had appeared to one of their own, and had left miraculous proof of her reality.

A Merciful Mother

Only 13 days after the Bishop-elect saw the picture of Our Lady on the tilma, the first modest chapel in response to her request was erected. It was dedicated the day after Christmas. Spaniards and Indians marched in procession, Cortez among them, from the cathedral in Mexico City to Tepeyac hill. The tilma was hung over the altar, and the Bishop said Mass beneath it. From that time on, Indians flocked to the shrine to view the painting. The primary lesson it had for them, writes Fr. Valentine Long, O.F.M., concerned the falsity of their religion; it taught them to abandon their errors. It freed them from bondage to a bloodthirsty religion which had cost thousands of lives each year.

There are a number of theories that have sprung up concerning the apparitions. There was a shrine of Our Lady of Guadalupe in Spain. There are Indian words—at least three different ones—that sound much the same as “Guadalupe”, and some chroniclers think that one or another of them was the one the Lady really used. But apparently Juan Diego did not protest that they had the name wrong, and if it had been, it seems as though he would have said so. Or, that Our Lady herself would have found a way to correct the error.

Another idea is that Our Lady appeared exclusively to and for the benefit of the Indians. But this does not agree with the words she spoke to Juan Diego.

According to the record of Miguel Sanchez published in 1648, Our Lady said to Juan Diego: “I am a merciful Mother to you and to all of your people, and to those who are devoted to me and to those who seek me out for help in their necessities.” She did not confine her motherhood to the Indians.

According to the account of Luis Lazo de la Vega, 1649: “I am in truth your merciful Mother—to you and to all the other people dear to me who call upon me, who search for me, who confide in me.”

Or, according to Luis Becerra Tanco, 1675: “to those who love me and seek me and to all who ask my protection.”

It seems plain that our Lady meant to declare herself a merciful Mother not only to the Indians but to all who love her and seek her out for help.

One thing certain about the miracle is that it freed the Indians from subservience to a religion that demanded human sacrifice and countenanced slavery, cannibalism and polygamy, and spread the light of Christ in the New World.

Bibliography

The Dark Virgin by Donald Demarest and Coley Taylor, Coley Taylor, Inc., 1956.

Mexico, a Land of Volcanoes by Bishop Joseph F. Schlarman, Bruce, 1950.

The Mother of God by Valentine Long, O.F.M., Franciscan Herald Press, 1976.

Am I Not Here? by Harold J. Rahm, S.J., Ave Maria Institute, 1961.

Monsignor Eugene Kevane, a member of the Pontifical Roman Academy of Theology, has been Dean of Education at The Catholic University of America, Director of the Notre Dame Pontifical Catechetical Institute, Professor of Catechetics at St. John's University in New York and at the Angelicum in Rome. At present he teaches at Notre Dame Institute in Arlington Va., and directs the Center for Family Catechetics. Acknowledgements and thanks to the *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*.

Synod, Catechism and Deposit of Faith

MGR. EUGENE KEVANE

"IT was a good news Synod", writes veteran newsman Dale Francis in his syndicated column after the event. "One of the most interesting, and perhaps the most unexpected, development at the synod was the agreement that there is need for an international catechism to state those Catholic teachings that are fundamental to our belief. It was strange when it came", he says, concluding his coverage, "for it was not mentioned among likely results, but then the synod alway was an occasion for surprise from the Holy Spirit".

It was indeed a good news Synod and not least for the priests and bishops of the Catholic Church. This project for an international catechism bears upon the very deposit of faith which makes bishops and priests to be what they are and to function as they do in serving the People of God. Thanks to this surprise from the Holy Spirit, as Dale Francis calls it accurately, we priests and bishops have a vital new opportunity and without doubt a special challenge of cooperation. It may be timely, therefore, to sketch the background.

The Church of the Apostles as it came from the hands of Jesus was a teaching Church. This is the very idea of

the New Testament. The Gospels report vividly the work of Jesus as a human *Rabbi* of his people and time, and as the Divine Teacher of mankind. The Acts of the Apostles show the Church evangelizing and teaching under the leadership of Peter. The Epistles reflect back upon Churches established everywhere by the Apostles through this process of a practical teaching which forms a new People of God with a new way of life. From beginning to end the New Testament bears witness to this fact of the teaching Church, and to the Church which has a doctrine to teach, the very doctrine of Jesus, "who is himself both the mediator and the sum total of Revelation."¹

"My dear friends", the Apostle Jude writes, "I appeal to you to fight hard for the faith which has been once and for all entrusted to the saints. Certain people have infiltrated among you . . ., turning the grace of our God into immorality, and rejecting our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ" (Jude 3-4). St. John is equally forthright. "If anybody does not keep within the teaching of Christ but goes beyond it", he writes, "he cannot have God with him : only those who keep to what he taught can have the Father and the Son with them. If anyone comes to you bringing a different doctrine, you must not receive him into your house or even give him a greeting. To greet him would make you a partner in his wicked work" (2 John 9-10). It is clear that Jesus gave his Apostles a definite teaching which they grasped as such and prized as a precious treasure.

Guard the deposit carefully

St. Paul has exactly the same position. "This is what you are to teach them to believe . . ., the sound teaching which is that of our Lord Jesus Christ, the doctrine which is in accordance with true religion" (1 Tim. 6:3). Hence his ringing admonition to "guard the deposit": "My dear Timothy, take great care of all that has been entrusted to you" (1 Tim. 6:20). And again : "Keep as your pattern the sound teaching you have heard from me, in the faith and love that are in Christ Jesus. You have been entrusted to look after something precious. Guard it with the help of the Holy Spirit who lives in us" (2 Tim. 1:13-14).

The deposit of faith, then, is Jesus' own teaching. It constitutes the very apostolicity of the Church, the founda-

tion upon which her unity, catholicity and holiness rest. Take away this apostolicity in teaching, and her other three marks will begin to crumble. All of this is implicit in Jesus' final teaching mandate to his Apostles: "Go, therefore, make disciples of all the nations; baptize them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and teach them to observe all the commands I gave you. And know that I am with you always; yes, to the end of time" (Matt. 28:19-20).

The Apostles, as a matter of historical fact, did as they were commanded. They established the on-going teaching Church everywhere, with one and the same teaching and formation unto the new way of life. The apostolic writings which form our New Testament minister to this teaching program: they were written out of it and for it. Later on the Fathers of the Church, great and learned pastoral bishops, conduct this teaching program in the Apostolic Churches into which they have succeeded. Their writings are a rich mine of information about the faith which was taught and about the formation of personal life in terms of that faith. Centuries went by, fifteen centuries prior to the invention of printing, and in all of them Jesus' program of teaching went forward faithfully by the procedures of oral teaching, raising up new generations of Catholic Christians, persons who learned to know the faith and to put it into the practice of daily life. It was instruction and simultaneous formation. It was the faith and personal response to the faith. This teaching program contains the deposit of faith which it guards by teaching it faithfully to the on-coming generation of Catholics.

Thus the teaching of the Apostles went forth and filled the whole earth through the on-going continuation of it by their successors. This is the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium. It gives to the People of God, and formatively to the children who project the future of the Church, that one and the same deposit of faith.

Fifteen centuries after Jesus' mandate to his teaching Church, a deep crisis had overtaken the deposit of faith, a crisis intensified by the recent invention of printing. To cope with the problem, the Supreme Magisterium decided to put into print the essentials of the catechetical teaching program, both its doctrinal content and its formative

structure, which had come from Jesus and his Apostles. The Holy See, on the authority of the Council of Trent, accompanied this project by means of a commission chaired by St. Charles Borromeo.²

Roman Catechism is magisterial

In this unique catechetical publication of the Catholic Church, one can see in print the deposit of faith as it has come forward across the centuries. In what one may well term a visible stroke of guidance by the Holy Spirit, the Holy See decided to rise above controversy with the Protestants in producing this work and to present in a positive manner the content and structure of the Apostolic heritage in catechetical teaching and formation. This printed *Catechism* was designed simply to show how to do the process of catechesis as it had come from Jesus and his Apostles. The Holy See created in print the abiding instrument for the renewal of the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium and thus for preserving the on-going apostolicity of the Catholic Church.

The Roman Catechism is divided into four parts which put the four basic headings of Christian teaching into a certain definite order. First, the Catholic Faith in itself, in the Articles of the Apostles' Creed. Then the triple response, the *metanoia* or conversion to God Incarnate by the following three personal activities of the new Christian way of life with the supernatural joy of authentic hope.

The Catholic Church rose above time in doing this catechetical work, to the level of Jesus' original redeeming intention when he gave his program of instruction and formation to his Apostles. To see this, one must reflect upon the nature of the deposit of faith and study it in the pages of this unique catechetical handbook. The teaching of the Church does not originate in our times, whether those of St. Charles Borromeo, or those of the recent synod. Her teaching was handed forward from Jesus by his Apostles and disseminated from them throughout the world. Thus the word "Apostolic" in the Creed as one of the marks of the true Church denotes the deposit of doctrine taught by the Church from the days of the Apostles to the present time.³

The Spirit acted at the Synod

With this one comes to the heart of the matter regarding the deposit of faith. It has been placed in the hands of the Apostles and their successors by Jesus himself as a divine deposit to be handed on not as an inert object but as a living teaching. And the deposit is guarded when the teaching is faithful. The action of the Holy Spirit at the recent synod is already coming into view.

Perhaps the best way to grasp what Jesus did is to study the section on "Holy Orders" in *The Roman Catechism*.⁴ By his will and intention, it is only the ministerial priest who, in virtue of the Sacrament of Holy Orders, can confer the Eucharistic sacrifice in the Person of Christ and offer it in the name of the entire Christian people. The power to confect the Sacrament of the Eucharist is necessarily connected with sacramental ordination. This is the very heart of the deposit of faith. When the Church in her creeds calls herself "apostolic", she expresses, besides the doctrinal identity of her teaching with that of the Apostles, the reality of the continuation of the work of the Apostles by means of the structure of succession in virtue of which the apostolic mission is to endure until the end of time.⁵

The deposit of faith, then, does indeed contain a truly priceless gift, namely Jesus himself really present and given to souls as their divine Savior and Holy Redeemer. He liberates the soul from sin and death: *inaestimabile donum* (inestimable gift). The doctrine of the faith centers upon Jesus in this particular manner. This centering upon Jesus results from the Apostles' Creed; it gives the Sacramental life its center, the Holy Eucharist; it gives divine strength for Gospel morality; and it creates the new personality of prayer and the interior life. All this is done by the deposit of faith.

From the beginning to end, then, *The Roman Catechism* involves the Mystery of Faith, which has been entrusted by the will and intention of Jesus at the Last Supper exclusively to the Apostles and their successors, when he gave them the power of confecting the Eucharist. "To the bishops alone, and to the priests they have made sharers in their ministry which they themselves have received, is reserved the power of renewing in the mystery of the Eucharist what

Christ did at the Last Supper.”⁶ Thus it is indeed true to say that the deposit of faith by its authoritative teaching makes bishops and priests to be what they are and to do what they do in the Church of God.

It was without doubt a special stroke of Providence which led the supreme government of the Catholic Church to produce this comprehensive catechetical manual for the pastor of souls and his helpers. At the same time there was a widely recognized need for a second book, deriving from *The Roman Catechism*, a small book stating in simple and clear terms the elements of the deposit of faith. For every teaching program has its elementary level. So too Jesus’ teaching program which hands on divine Revelation in the Church: by virtue of being fully human as well as divine, it will have “the simple and objective kind of instruction which is appropriate for children.”⁷ With the invention of printing, booklets containing this content began to multiply. As a matter of historical fact, Martin Luther’s *Small Catechism* was the first to make widespread use of the printing press to guide elementary instruction. Catholic catechisms followed suit, and the Holy See itself recognized the importance of this printed instrument by commissioning St. Robert Bellarmine to do a simple catechism, deriving from *The Roman Catechism*, for the elementary level of teaching. It was published in 1598 by order of Pope Clement VIII. This became the model for the many national, regional and even diocesan catechisms in the Catholic Church, including the Baltimore Catechism, in the United States. As time went on, however, it became apparent that these catechisms varied widely in quality, and some contained visible defects. Thus in the years leading to Vatican I, more and more pastoral voices were heard calling for a uniform universal catechism from the Holy See to be associated everywhere with *The Roman Catechism* in order to secure the deposit of faith and its pastoral care of souls.

As a result, under the leadership of the Holy See, a *Project for a Small Catechism* was presented to the Fathers of Vatican Council I on January 14, 1870, following the Catechism of St. Robert Bellarmine as a model, and designed to be the universal catechism of the Catholic Church for use in explaining the elements of the deposits of faith. The Council Fathers worked for four months on this out-

line, with voluminous pastoral discussions and interventions which are a mine of information on the idea of a universal catechism. This material is helpful to this day and has a current importance in the light of the recent synod in Rome.⁸

After thorough discussion in eight General Sessions of Vatican I, the uniform universal catechism was brought to the formal vote of the Ecumenical Council on May 4, 1870, with an overwhelming majority in favor of the project. It remained only to promulgate the decision at a future Solemn Session of the Council. In the vicissitudes of the time, however, this promulgation never took place due to the gathering clouds of the Franco-Prussian War. Pope Pius IX had to suspend the Council rather abruptly later in 1870. Thus, while formally approved by the Ecumenical Council, the Universal Catechism was not carried into effect.

The idea was not forgotten, however, and was considered a matter simply suspended and awaiting God's time, as the initiatives of Popes St. Pius X, Benedict XV, Pius XII and John XXIII on behalf of the Universal Catechism make clear.⁹ Among these successors of St. Peter, St. Pius X stands out because of his *Catechism of Christian Doctrine*. A lifelong pastoral catechist himself, St. Pius X intended to keep the idea of the Universal Catechism alive by publishing this Catechism, the only such instrument ever done and published at the level of the Holy See, and fostering its use throughout Italy and beyond. When he was a young priest, Pius X drew up a handwritten catechism for his own work in pastoral teaching. He did not use his personal work for his *Catechism of Christian Doctrine*, however, but turned to the famous and tested *Compendium of Christian Doctrine*, a catechism done by bishops in Northern Italy, as its basis. The principle of continuity in handing on the elements of the deposit of faith becomes remarkably visible, for in the Pastoral letter which enjoins the use of this particular small catechism, its relationship to, and direct derivation from, *The Roman Catechism* is explicitly discussed and clarified. St. Pius X developed this catechetical instrument with children from the neighbourhood of St. Peter's in Rome. Thus the *Catechism of Christian Doctrine* published by St. Pius X reflects the abiding idea of a printed instrument for the elementary level which

distills the essence of the deposit of faith as taught across the centuries and as put comprehensively into print in *The Roman Catechism*.

Beginning in 1835, a movement began to grow within the Church which constitutes a new dimension of danger for the handing on of the deposit of faith. Reduced to its fundamental and common denominator from that day to this it represents an effort at philosophical reinterpretation of the deposit, so that it does not have the same meaning for Christians today as it had for the Apostles. This actually sets the entire Apostles' Creed aside at one stroke. Hence it is truly "the summation of all the heresies", as St. Pius X called it, for previous heresies were only partial, singling out this or that Article of Faith for erroneous interpretation. But this movement affects the deposit as a whole, all of its Articles, and all of the dogmas by which the Church has defended and explained the various Articles across the centuries since Jesus gave his teaching to the Apostles and their successors. In most recent times, furthermore, this movement has gone on quite logically to reinterpret the deposit of Gospel morality as well.

Modernism reinterprets the Gospel

This movement of philosophical reinterpretation of the divine deposit was actually the reason why the Church convened the First Vatican Council. The central teaching of the Council meets the new movement accurately and forcefully: "If anyone should say that with the progress of knowledge it is sometimes possible that dogmas proposed by the Church can be given a meaning different from the one that the Church has understood and still understands, let him be anathema."¹⁰ This of course was in 1870, long before St. Pius X. But to his surprise there were priests within the Church who continued the effort at philosophical reinterpretation of the deposit despite the formal decision of the Ecumenical Council. "Former heresies", writes Father George Tyrrell, one of the leaders of the on-going movement in early Twentieth Century, "questioned this or that dogma. Modernism criticizes the very idea of dogma . . . , of revelation. . . . What is common to all Roman Catholic Modernists is the belief in a possible reconciliation of their Catholicism with the results of historical criticism...

This reconciliation practically consists in a rereading or reinterpretation of their Catholicism. Plainly this implies philosophizing."¹¹ St. Pius X had no choice but to condemn this project, now doubly wicked, basing his defense of the deposit of faith firmly on Vatican I and stating explicitly that the Apostles' Creed does indeed have the same meaning for Christians today as it had for the Apostles who learned that meaning from Jesus their Divine Teacher.¹² This connection with Jesus is the reason why St. Paul states the charter of the catechetical teaching of the deposit of faith: "You heard the message that we brought you as God's message, you accepted it for what it really is, God's message and not some human thinking; and it is still a living power among you who believe it" (1 Thess. 2:13).

To complete the background for the decision by the recent synod for the universal catechism one must reflect on the fact that the Modernist Movement in recent decades has entered the field of religious education. As everyone knows, the philosophical theologies continue to proliferate, pushing forward the general project for philosophical reinterpretation of the deposit. But the threatening new dimension is the recent application of these theologies to produce a deviated catechesis which withholds the very elements of the divine deposit from Catholic children. The heartrending result has been seen by many, the sight of Catholic children receiving their First Holy Communion, who bear witness by their behavior to the fact that they have not really been catechized and literally do not know what they are doing. In actual practice, as Cardinal Ratzinger has been pointing out, the effect of the mistaken approach has been the suppression of the catechism, which results in a deepening of religious ignorance. The very elements of Christian Doctrine, which are the very Articles of Faith, are systematically withheld from the catechumens.

Faith is kept from catechumens

The recent Synod, then, does indeed have a background. One must expect that the Modernist Movement will use every device and tactic in opposition to this surprise of the Holy Spirit, the firm decision for the Universal Catechism. It is a vital new opportunity for us priests and bishops, indeed, but it is likely to contain even more a challenge of

cooperation with the Holy See. The Supreme Government of the Catholic Church, the Synod of bishops and the Holy See, has taken the action. But that government must have obedience and loyal support. Is this not the very idea of the word "Catholic", especially in the case of the Catholic priest ?

The truth is that the Modernist Movement cannot really win, because it cannot take pastoral care of souls. The reason lies in the very nature of the deposit of faith. This deposit is not a mere abstract teaching, but an action-oriented intervention of divine power into human lives. As St. Paul says, "it is a living power among you who believe it." The deposit teaches the arrangement which Jesus made to secure his redeeming presence and power. It contains the doctrine and effects the reality of the Holy Eucharist. At the very center and heart of the revealed religion taught, established and implemented by the deposit is the Real Presence of the Victim offered in the Sacrifice of the New Testament. When human persons are properly catechized, when the Articles of Faith and Morals are fully and completely explained with the help of the Church's own catechism, they know they receive their divine Savior and Holy Redeemer. The living power of revealed religion enters their lives with transforming effect. They leave the old moral discouragement and defeatism behind, that common affliction of today, and turn toward their new personal future filled with the promises of Christ.

One cannot learn this identity of priests and bishops from theologians simply as such. One learns it from the deposit of faith, just as authentic theologians do, so that they can deepen understanding and love for the priceless gift by means of their theologizing. The priests who are using the True Devotion of St. Louis de Montfort are having a wonderful success with Catholic teenagers. The reason is clear. The True Devotion teaches that central heart of the deposit, the fact that Mary was conceived without sin, redeemed in advance by her own Son, so that he could have a human nature utterly untouched by sin. When the deposit brings it about by its divine teaching that souls receive her Son, therefore, they are lifted into the new coming world of liberation from our natural sinful condition. Young people today want this liberation. The

worldwide catechism will sustain and support among the People of God this realization of the meaning of the Incarnation. The catechism will help priests and bishops to break the power of evil over souls and to renew spiritual hope and joy. It will state the truths of the deposit which sets souls free.

Break the power of evil

The recent synod was indeed a good news event. When parents in homes and priests in parishes combine the coming new universal catechism with the changeless principles of pastoral care contained in the Roman Catechism, that true renewal for which Vatican II aspired will be taking place. And the children of Catholic parents will know exactly what they are doing on the day of their First Holy Communion.

A catechism is simply the elementary explanation of the meaning of the Articles of Faith. Why should it not be one and the same worldwide? For the meaning of the Articles constitutes the witness of the Catholic Church to Jesus Christ in his Lordship. "You will be my witness" (Acts 1:8), Jesus said to the same ones whom he had personally instructed and formed for their mission to teach all nations (see Matt. 28:16-2). This witnessing is the handing on of Jesus' deposit of faith which his teaching Church is to guard (1 Tim. 6:20). When this is done, all who are catechized know the Mystery of Faith: they recognize ever more fully the priceless gift which comes to each redeemed person through the ministry of the priests and bishops acting in the person of Jesus.

A project dooms itself to ashes

The Synod has taken an action in the context of the abiding sameness of meaning in this apostolic teaching which the official catechisms implement. The project for a philosophically reinterpreted Catholic Faith is intrinsically impossible. It is doomed to turn to ashes for lack of power to regenerate and renew. The new universal catechism will put the lengthy effort to rest at last. The threat to the apostolicity and the indefectibility of the Church will subside, for they are both a function of the purity and

integrity of the catechetical order of teaching. Dale Francis' report is strikingly accurate: "It was a good news Synod".

* A cassette recording of the above article may be obtained from: Cardinal Communications, Box 34, New London, Conn. 06320. Price \$3.50 postpaid (Canada: add 50c).

1. Vatican II, "Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation", no. 2; in Austin Flanney, O.P. (ed.) *Vatican Council II* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1975), p. 751.

2. For a summary of the background and the process which produced this landmark in the handing on of the deposit, see my Introduction to *The Roman Catechism*, newly translated by Robert I. Bradley, S.J., and myself, and published by the Daughters of St. Paul (Boston: St. Paul Editions, 1985).

3. This is the teaching of *The Roman Catechism* on the nature of the Apostolicity of the Church; see pp. 108-109.

4. See pp. 307-326.

5. This summarizes the teaching of Vatican II, Constitution on the Church no. 20, in the words of the Letter of the Holy See on "The Minister of the Eucharist", August 6, 1983.

6. Letter of the Holy See, August 6, 1983.

7. Words of the *General Catechetical Directory*, no. 83.

8. See J. D. Mansi (ed.) *Sacrorum Conciliorum Collectio* (Leipzig: 1962). Vols. 50 and 51, containing the record of the discussions and interventions on the Small Catechism; for the tabulation of the votes, see Vol. 51; pp. 500-512. The Council Fathers were explicitly aware of the crucial importance of the Small Catechism in guarding the deposit of faith professed by the Apostle's Creed. Several alluded to the recently published book by Ernest Renan on "The Religious Future of Modern Society" in which he ridiculed the idea of creeds and authorized teaching as mere dead-letter formalism and called for a new approach liberated from formulated doctrine.

9. For a summary of the documentation see J. M. Gimenez, "A propositio del Proyecto de 'Catecismo Universal'", *Scripta Theologica* (1985) 245-253.

10 DS 3043.

11. George Tyrrell, *Christianity at the Crossroads* (London: Longmans, 1909), pp. 10-11 and 13. Today Father Tyrrell's position is called "The New Hermeneutic", the generating principle of an entire literature of philosophical "theology", or, more accurately, of philosophy of religion.

12. See DS 3462.

From Henry Morse by Father Philip Carraman, S.J.

I was asked whether I was a Catholic: I admitted that I was. "A Roman Catholic?", the Judge asked. "Of course", I said, "a Roman Catholic. What other kind of Catholic can there be?". (Chap.: 13 — the Trial)

— R. S.

Acknowledgements and thanks to *Prag.*, 40 Albany Court, Epping, Essex CH16 5ED, for permission to reprint this short, but incisive article.

Next Year in St. Petersburg

JOHN BIGGS-DAVISON, M.P.

IN May 1985 we commemorated Victory in Europe. As the first leader of *The Times* observed, it was a celebration for half of Europe. That leading article also described the Anglo-Soviet alliance of 1941 as “a strategic necessity” and reminded readers that Winston Churchill declared that if the Nazis invaded hell he would have been bound to put in a good word for the devil!

Churchill unsaid no word that he had uttered against Communism — and some of his words were suitably lurid — but allied governments, notably the United States of Franklin D. Roosevelt, pretended to themselves and their peoples that the Muscovite Marxists meant the same as they by such words as “democracy”, “freedom”, “liberation”, “self-determination”, and “free elections”.

In defending that half of Europe that has not been overrun by the Soviet empire, we have to hold the line upon the continent and secure our indispensable supplies and trade routes in other continents and across the oceans. We have also to contend with those who harbour or exploit the illusions of the 1940s which in the 1980s are not wholly extinct.

Still, in the jargon of the UN and the parlance of much Western journalism, politics, and diplomacy, it is Soviet and Marxist definitions of “imperialism” and “colonialism” that find most general acceptance. The USSR has a superiority of conventional armed forces; it has a superiority too in the struggle of semantics. The only expanding world empire left accuses the West of “imperialism” and “colonialism” while committing genocide in Afghanistan.

Solzhenitsyn said : "The all-permeating lie is the most burdensome trait of the regime". So successful, he went on, was Soviet rewriting of history, that Soviet people knew more about early nineteenth century Russia than about their country today. He quoted an elegant piece of Soviet poetry :

"We have shot Russia in its big bottom. So that walking over its body shall rise Communism-Messiah."

The Red Third Rome !

The Russian past is either blotted out or distorted : Stolypin reforms; elected *Duma*; abolished death penalty; advances in sciences and technology that alarmed the Central Powers and rattled their sabres. Did I hear the word "Sikorski" recently ?

For the naive western liberal it is but a short step from his belief in progress to the Marxist conveyor belt or escalator of history. It can be slowed by reaction but never stopped.

Many of the very best intentioned assume that post-revolution must be better than pre-revolution : Cromwell than Charles I; Castro than Batista; any corrupt nationalist dictator carried on the tide of European decolonization than the most benign European tutelage. As for Haiti and the Philippines : we shall see.

In Russia even the nastiest Reds are conceived of as better than the Whites. The knout-wielding Cossack, the *Okhrana*, internal exile — these are stereotypes of Tsarism. But contrast the mild internal exile of Lenin — he was able to live comfortably and enjoy his sport of shooting — with the Gulag of Solzhenitsyn.

Stalin's slave camps exceeded the concentration camps of Nazi Germany. But how many who have heard of Auschwitz have heard of that cold Auschwitz, Kolyma ?

Those who take their history from films like *Reds* will have difficulty in believing Solzhenitsyn's description of the Bolshevik Revolution as a gangster coup that "deprived our people of all their rights and later seized the peasants' land (though according to the revolutionary fable they gave land to the peasants). They have turned a wealthy country into a hungry and miserable country by exterminating tens

of millions of peasants". With his family background, Gorbachev must know about this.

In 1917 elections were held. The Bolsheviks received nine million votes; but other candidates, 25 million. So they suppressed the Constituent Assembly by force.

No nation loves soil and fatherland more than the Russians. Stalin could not withstand Germany's eastern drive without invoking the ikon and restoring the epaulette. It had to be a Patriotic War; the inspiration of resistance was not Marxism-Leninism but a nobler, older tradition.

The Soviet empire is corrupt. It will meet the fate of other, and worthier empires. The future policy of the Russias and of Russia-in-Asia will be for the liberated to decide. But one may note that during the Hungarian uprising against Soviet Communism the old monarchy was remembered. The Crown was a gleaming sign of freedom. It could be thus in a free Russia.

Monarchy, after all, belongs to the future. It is not a picturesque, romanticized survival. The Monarchist League of Canada has taken as its slogan: "Monarchy is the best policy".

Monarchy is stronger in the Commonwealth and on the Continent than it was a generation ago. It is much stronger in Britain than under Queen Victoria, when statesmen such as Sir Charles Dilke and Joseph Chamberlain looked forward to the republic when her reign ended. The monarchy has been restored in a democratic Spain.

In Bagehot's phrase, monarchy is the system that enables government to be intelligible. He went further: "The mass of mankind understands it; they hardly anywhere in the world understand any other".

Latin Mass "Requiem" in Westminster Cathedral

So still, so silent,
Who would know
Six hundred were there?
And in that blessed, blessed peace,
I lost my wretched self in God,
And prayed my wordless prayer.

R. S.

In the second part of this review-article, Father Crane shows, following the analysis of Anne Roche Muggeridge in her book, how the neo-Modernists harnessed the theological evolutionism of Pierre de Chardin as the vehicle best suited to propagandize their thinking and highlight their attacks on the Catholic Church. The roots of the confusion that besets the Church today are to be found here.

CURRENT COMMENT

Revolution in the Church : 2

THE EDITOR

Modernist Resurgence

OF the interval that elapsed between what one might call the end of the temporary suppression of Modernism in 1910 and the surfacing of the Revolution it embodied during the Second Vatican Council, one can say that Modernism exercised increased sway, not only over the minds of those who survived Pius X's attack and their successors, but over those also of a widening band of Religious and Clerics, most of them academically and professionally engaged. These chafed at the restrictions to which they were restricted by Religious and ecclesiastical Authorities. Confronted by a world victimized by two Great Wars and which they thought of, accurately enough, as in process of rapid change, their secret longing was for a flexibility — doctrinally, morally and structurally — that would enable the Church to cope as they saw it with the demands of what they thought of as the New Age that lay ahead. They needed scope. To do that, as they saw it, the Catholic Church had to break out of the old-time and ageless categories of thought and action that caged her in and, with her, themselves. Frustration at her seeming

unwillingness and inability to "move with the times" planted a growing anti-authoritarian seed in their minds, which burgeoned as their frustration increased. Restlessness grew within the ranks of clergy and religious and, with it, dissent. Modernism capitalized on this situation. Out of this came its resurgence, which is afflicting the Church so terribly today. Anne Muggeridge makes quite clear where Modernism stands with its adherents over and against the Catholic Church :

"In the late twentieth century, the Church has still not changed its mind about the nature of truth. Vatican II spoke of truth as something valid for all time, revealed by God through the Scriptures and in the unwritten tradition, both sources 'to be accepted and venerated with the same sense of loyalty and reverence'. To this 'sacred deposit', the 'heritage of faith', the whole Church must always 'remain steadfast', 'holding, practising and professing' it 'in a single common effort' (*Dei Verbum*, 9, 10). The modern Church perseveres in believing that truth is objective and immutable, and in rejecting the idea that it is subjective, relative, historically conditioned, and evolving. Modernists, for their part, continue to maintain that all doctrinal construction is relative, that the locus of revelation is experience, and that doctrine develops, not as the flower from the seed, as in the older image, but as the human being from the fish, in evolutionary jumps." (p. 28)

Modernists Use of Teilhard de Chardin

As Anne Muggeridge points out so well, what the new resurgent Modernism needed if its own revolutionary doctrines were to be presented as legitimate developments of scriptural revelation was a radical theory of theological evolution. This they found in the para-scientific theory of cosmic evolution, which was the brain-child of the French Jesuit, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin. This became the vehicle, selected by the Modernists for the furtherance in deadly fashion of their ideas with regard to radical development in the structures and dogmas of the Catholic Church. The Trojan Horse was there, ready-built for them. The Modernists harnessed it to their purposes with devastating effect. Anne Muggeridge writes: "The evolutionary

transfiguration Teilhard prophesied was not at all identical with the revolution in religious consciousness envisioned by Modernists, yet they used his vision to legitimate the latter, as successfully and as cynically as Charles Darwin had exploited the budding scientific reputation and innocence of the young Teilhard to validate the Piltdown forgery" (P. 40).

Teilhard's Outlook Outlined

What follows is a long quotation, for which I ask the Author's (and the Publisher's) pardon. I do so because I am quite incapable of presenting Teilhard's case against the revealed religion of the Catholic Church with the brilliance and compact clarity that Anne Muggeridge, in this book, makes peculiarly her own. Yet the case *must* be presented, if only for the fact that, encapsulated within her pages devoted to Teilhard, you will find the source-points of the many faceted attack that the neo-Modernist Revolution is thrusting at the heart of the Catholic Church today, not from outside, but from within her very self. Here, then, is the long and very important quotation the reading and study of which, I hope, will lead all who can to buy this vitally incisive study :

"Teilhard believed that evolution proceeds through a build-up of psychic energy until a boiling-point is reached, whereupon a jump occurs to a higher level of complexity. Such a jump took place, he believed, when our animal ancestors broke through into consciousness. We are now on the threshold of another jump as the organization of human psychic energy leads to the emergence of a common human soul. According to Teilhard, an envelope of conscious thought, which he dubbed the 'noosphere', now surrounds the 'biosphere', the physical world. Evidence of this commutarian consciousness is to be found in the rapid socialization of human societies, a sign of 'the completion of hominization', which Teilhard welcomes.

"It is easy to see how attractive Teilhard's idea of irresistible evolution towards a higher understanding was for men who wanted to challenge not only earlier formulations of truth but also the very idea that truth

could ever be immutable, absolute. Man is 'becoming', carried forward on an advancing wave of consciousness, a mystical flux in which nothing can be fixed. The only absolute is change. Radical change is thus not to be feared, but is holy, since it brings us always closer to identity with God. As human consciousness expands, the simpler, cruder understandings of reality that earlier satisfied it can no longer be accepted. The evolving mind is now physiologically unable to tolerate them. Understanding has now shifted from the historical and physical to the cosmic and spiritual plane. The evolution of man's religious understanding cannot be resisted, though probably only a minority of men have yet experienced an evolutionary break through. Perhaps indeed, only a few members of a species ever do initiate increased 'complexity consciousness', but these are the future; lower strains die off, as they are meant to. . . .

"The change from an historical to a psychological understanding of scripture is the core of the modernist attempt to 'rescue' (quotes mine, the Editor) the Christian message. It is ironic that Teilhard was co-opted to this endeavour, for the one thing he could never be accused of was thinking metaphorically about Catholicism. For him, the evolution of mind and matter towards unity with God was as physical and historical a phenomenon as the rocks and bones he studied. However, though Teilhard, as he insisted, may not have been a modernist in the classical sense, his method was identical with that of modernism, in that it allowed the language of a dogma to be retained while it simply emptied it of its traditional intellectual content.

"A case in point is Teilhard's treatment of the presence of evil in the world. In Scripture, sin enters the world through the conscious decision of the first man and woman to disobey God, a moral choice. For Teilhard, evil was rather 'a statistically inevitable by-product of a universe in the course of unification with God'. Sin is a natural feature in the structure of the world. Just as failures, bad starts, and wrong directions leading to extinction are accompanying features of natural evolution, so sin is inseparable from cosmogenesis (Teilhard's version of evolution, the Editor). It is the condition of

multiplicity struggling towards unity. In this account, sin may still be said to be 'original', but obviously not in the way the Old and New Testaments understand the term.

"Just as obviously, Teilhard's understanding destroys the traditional Christian understanding of the Atonement and the Redemption — that as sin and death entered the world by one man, Adam, so by one man, Christ, the New Adam, sin and death were overcome. . .

"This one example of Teilhard's singular modernism indicates his multi-faceted usefulness to theological revolutionaries. Its value for theological reformation is immediately apparent. Just as apparent was the use of his teaching on sin to justify political and social revolution. The modern development by Gregory Baum (an ex-priest, Editor) and other liberation theologians of Teilhard's concept of sin as structural rather than personal has informed the present attack by Catholic intellectuals on the governing political and economic systems of the West.

"Though Teilhard himself maintained a patrician aloofness from politics, his theory that modern collectivizing movements (including Fascism and Marxism) announced a new level in the emergence of a unified consciousness, helped to make radical socialism religiously respectable, even necessary, despite the fact that the Church had hitherto condemned it. Much of the present enthusiasm of Catholic intellectuals for left-wing revolutionary movements, in particular those with strong religious coloration, as in Nicaragua, claims support from Teilhard's thought. . . .

"It is also possible to trace to Teilhard the inspiration for much of 'the global village' thinking of the powerful post-Vatican II bureaucracies, for collectivist activities like the Basic Christian Communes and for the idea that a synthesis between Christianity and Marxism is inevitable. Initially cool to Marxism, Teilhard came to teach that 'the Christian and the Marxist must eventually come together because in the nature of things everything that rises must converge' (pp. 40-42)".

An Important Foot-Note

There it is. I spoke of a long quotation and I am not ashamed of having indulged in it. My hope and prayer is that it will lead readers to the beginning, at least, of an understanding of the roots of the trouble that continues to afflict the Church so sorely and that, from their grasp of those beginnings they will be led to buy and to study this splendid book. (1) A short foot-note needs to be appended. Itself in the form of a quotation, it high-lights an important point. The Author writes: "A further important insight for which neo-Modernists are indebted to Teilhard de Chardin is that the revolutionary Catholic intellectual ought never to leave the Catholic Church. Earlier doctrinal controversies had ended with the expulsion of the revolutionaries and their ideas and with the magisterium of the Church still firmly holding the power of interpretation and definition. Teilhard's career suggested that this suicidal course was not inevitable. Like the modernists he believed that the Church had 'a time of mutation, a necessary reformation, much more profound than that of the XVIth century . . . a matter not of institutions and morality but of faith'. Teilhard thought that a new Christology was about to give birth to 'the religion of the future (42, 43).'" It was the duty of those who thought as he did to remain within the Catholic Church and bend their best efforts to assist at the birth. We know to our great cost that this is precisely what they are doing today. They have taken Teilhard's words to heart. They have learnt, too, the value of the kind of double-speak he employed as cover for his ulterior designs with regard to the Church. They have shown themselves adept at employing the same cover today.

Seeds of a New Faith in Teilhard

I would ask the reader to study this long quotation with the utmost care. As he does so he will discover that the seeds of a New Faith, in stark contrast to the old, are here; ammunition in plenty for the Revolution that would dis-

(1) *The Desolate City (Revolution in the Catholic Church)* by Anne Roche Muggeridge; Harper & Row, Publishers, 10 East 53rd St., New York, N.Y. 10022, U.S.A. Obtainable in the U.K. from The Holy Cross Catholic Bookshop, 4 Brownhill Road, Catford, London SE26 2 FJ; Price inquiries to the Publishers or Holy Cross Catholic Bookshop.

place the Truth consigned by God to the safe-keeping of the Church founded by His Son. For this, the revolutionaries would substitute their own evolving concept of "Church" as the whole human caravan of mankind on the march towards that ultimate convergence of mind and matter in God which, for them, as for Teilhard, represented the ultimate all-in-all. Radical change is the natural ally of the new Caravan Church, for change means breaking through the "stagnant" and "out-of-date" formularies and formalities of revealed and organized religion, whether it be of Christ, Buddha, or Mahomet or any religious founder. To quote once again Anne Muggeridge in her account of Teilhard's thinking: "Man is 'becoming', carried forward on an advancing wave of consciousness, a mystical flux in which nothing can be fixed. The only absolute is change. Radical change is thus not to be feared, but is holy, since it brings us always closer to identity with God. As human consciousness expands, the simpler, cruder understanding of reality is now physiologically unable to tolerate them. Understanding has shifted from the historical and physical to the cosmic and spiritual plane" (Cf. the long quotation given above, *op.cit.*, p. 41). Here, then, you have the way laid open for so many contemporary scripture scholars, with their disregard and discarding of the historical Christ and in His place the substitution of what you might call an impressionist Christ whose significance and meaningfulness for the reader of the Gospels represents the core of their necessarily subjective truth. I am reminded again of a story I mentioned once before in *Christian Order*; the story of a novice in a Religious Order (not in this country), who was told by his Novice Master, "It's not what you think but what you *feel* that counts". The novice left and found refuge after some time in a Catholic seminary that was truly Catholic.

Liberation the Watchword

The watchword that Teilhard has bequeathed, however unknowingly, to so many Catholics — priests and religious in particular — is, I would say, Liberation — from all that trammels the human spirit; above all objective truth and the Hierarchical, God-given Authority of the Catholic Church that upholds it. These must go as inimical to

man's self-fulfilment on his own terms; radical change that is holy because bringing him closer to identity with God. One is left with the thought — at popular level, so to say, within the Catholic Church — that God is immanent in man fulfilled on his own terms and that radical change, as the instrument of that fulfilment can only be described as holy. It is not difficult to see that this kind of thinking, combined with the contemporary dessication of the Gospels, already referred to above, lies at the heart of the basic communities with their rejection of the objective truth of the Gospels, of the teaching of the Catholic Church to which Christ consigned that truth and of the Authority of Peter's successor, the Pope, who is charged with upholding and promoting it.

Modernist Revolutionaries and Vatican II

Seen against this picture, which I have tried — I hope not unsuccessfully — to make as clear as possible, the Second Vatican Council appears as an occasion when a covert group of revolutionaries (many of them *periti* or "experts, as they were called, brought to the Council to advise the Bishops) used the opportunity provided to infect the Church with their poisonous combination of subjective relativism, where Catholic Truth was concerned, along with a virulent anti-papal-authoritarianism. Both are running rampant in the Church today. To the point, in fact, where dissent, as embodied in the likes of Charles Curran, Schilleebeeckx, Kung and the rest of them, increasingly appears as ruling the waves.

The revolutionaries at the Council were able the more easily to pull off their coup precisely because some of the Bishops in attendance were primarily concerned, not at all with the rejection of the principle of Church authority as such, but with what they thought of as a strong tendency towards over-centralized authoritarianism which, in their view, typified the Vatican Curia. Whether or not they were right in this view has no place for discussion in this review-article. The sole point I am trying to make is that the rebellion against what they thought of as over-centralized Roman Curial Authority left the ranks of the Council Bishops open to penetration by the neo-Modernist *periti*,

bent on the rejection of the very principle of hierarchial ecclesiastical authority as such. This was the ultimate goal of the neo-modernist revolutionaries. And the penetration was effected the more easily because of the understandable ignorance of some of the Council Fathers of the theological debates and discussions that had been sizzling in mainland Europe above and below ground since the close of World War II. Some of the Bishops came to the Council in ignorance of the theological situation and it was their fate, outside Council sessions, to be talked to and lectured at — as they saw it, in an effort to better their knowledge — by those very people who were bent on destroying the Church they loved. The lectures left them bemused to the point where some could not see the way in which what they thought of correctly enough as their rightful protest against overcentralized Vatican Authoritarianism was being harnessed to serve the purposes of a radical and faithless revolution. The results of this failure are with us now. The Revolution surfaced on the occasion of the Council and went on to break out into the open in the Council's wake, under the guise of post-conciliar renewal and what is called, so wrongly, "the spirit of Vatican II".

It is strongly to be hoped that the attainment of what appears as a revolutionary high-point was halted with the dislodging of Father Charles Curran from his dissenting perch as Professor of Moral Theology in the Catholic University of Washington. Hope comes in now to strengthen our Faith.

**CORPUS CHRISTI CHURCH,
MAIDEN LANE, STRAND,
LONDON, W.C.2.**

EVERY MONDAY

TRIDENTINE MASS AT 5.45 P.M.

Preceded by

ROSARY & BENEDICTION AT 5.15 P.M.

James V. Schall is associate professor of government at Georgetown University. His most recent work is entitled *The Politics of Heaven and Hell*.

Political Philosophy and Modern Religion

JAMES V. SCHALL, S.J.

AT one time, not too long ago, the Catholic Church appeared to be a cohesive organization, with clearly defined and widely known beliefs and practices. Not every Catholic fully grasped or practiced every tenet of his faith, but not believing or not practicing was not rationalized into a religious virtue. Failures, sins, or errors, that is to say, were not mistaken for righteousness or truth.

This capacity to understand the place of deviation from practice or belief allowed space for forgiveness and for spiritual and ecclesiastical standards. It permitted an acknowledgment of personal responsibility. The solution to a problem of disbelief or vice was not to change the definition of a belief or virtue so that the disbeliever would not feel "uncomfortable". Truth and virtue were not understood to be relative to time, place, or culture. The extreme formulation of modern democracy, namely, that freedom exists only on the hypothesis that nothing is true, was rightly seen as intrinsically hostile to Catholicism.

No one had to believe or agree with any doctrine or practice, of course, but there was, on the part of many, a kind of grudging admiration for what the church held about itself. Anyone who objected to essential Catholic teachings could join some institution that was more in conformity with what he held. It seemed odd to think that the church should change to conform to anyone's private views.

There was, furthermore, an intellectual structure in which any doctrinal or moral position could be placed and defended, more or less adequately, against any outside doubt or criticism. This was the primary function that a *philosophia perennis* could provide for the faith. This sort

of church was a kind of anathema to the modern rationalist mind, no doubt. On the other hand, without this stability, modernity had nothing against which to define itself. The loss of doctrinal standards paradoxically led to the establishment of nothing but change, with the necessary loss of any abiding standards.

Indeed, proponents of modernization long held that religion would simply "disappear" as people grew more "reasonable". But it now looks like religion will not disappear in the normal sense of that prediction. Rather, it appears that religion will end up maintaining about itself the same beliefs as those held by modernists. These beliefs are now couched in several easily adaptable terms like "dialogue", "rights", "liberation", "concern", "sincerity", or "benevolence". Some Christian phraseology remains in use, but its content will be taken from modernity, not from biblical or classical sources. The superstructure will be there, but the heart of belief will be gone.

The novelist Walker Percy, himself a convert, was recently asked bluntly whether he agreed that the Lefebvrites were just as bad as "the left-wingers who want to throw things out?" Percy's answer, I think, is typical of a growing number of bemused observers remarking on what is actually happening within the local churches:

Maybe not quite as bad when you consider heterodox priests and heretical theologians—is there such a thing as heresy any more? I'm not sure what, if any, doctrine (church) liberals would retain, except apparently a vague Congregationalist idea of the people of God, which seems to be a sort of low-grade Unitarianism.¹

What makes this passage remarkable is simply that Percy asked the right questions seldom heard in the public order of the church itself.

The basic question Percy brought up is whether we can identify the "church", as that organization has historically defined herself, with the Christian institutions we now encounter. The hierarchy and organization have been established for the preservation and defence of the church, but do these things represent any longer what the church has classically held about itself?

Recently, for instance, I was talking to an ex-Episcopalian clergyman who told me that he was once interested in

becoming a Roman Catholic, but as far as he could see, in practice in its local institutions, the Roman church now holds the same vague proclivities found in the Episcopalian church, so there was no sense in changing. This is a very widespread feeling, I suspect.

While this may represent a minority reflection, one that I find almost impossible to state clearly in the modern media or academic environment, it is a view that many, such as Walker Percy, automatically recognize as implicitly true. One of the most curious side issues to the massive media coverage of the Curran affair in the United States — a belated sign that the Roman authorities of the church finally seem to realize how far the issue has gone — was that almost every interviewer or reporter recognized that what Father Curran was writing and teaching was not objectively what the church taught. This was simply taken for granted by every interviewer, be he Jew, Protestant, Catholic, or secular liberal, as beyond question.

Curran himself, moreover, maintained that he belonged to some "church" of the future that would apparently come to be structured along lines he had outlined, but one not in conformity with the present or historical church in essential doctrinal or practical points. If the church does come to hold what a Curran or Kung might teach, one must wonder, in passing, what is to happen to those who hold the historical and intellectual validity of the original church? Do they, like the rich man in the Gospels, simply go away sad?

The only real perplexity, I suppose, is why anyone who knows he does not hold what the church officially maintains would want to stay in the organization. This seems to have been one of the things about which several reporters did wonder. We have often to look to people like Solzhenitsyn to remind us of the essence of our spiritual heritage.

If, as claimed by humanism, man were born only to be happy, he would not be born to die. Since his body is doomed to death, his task on earth evidently must be more spiritual, not a total engrossment in everyday life, not the search for the best ways to obtain material goods and then their carefree consumption. It has to be the fulfillment of a permanent, earnest duty so that

one's life journey may become above all an experience of moral growth: to leave life a better human being than one started it.²

This sense of a transcendent purpose is not the mark of contemporary Christianity, but, as Solzhenitsyn understood, it is the mark of classical Christianity.

The formal conversion of Augustine began some 1,600 years ago, in A.D. 386. On reading recently an essay by Paul Valadier, S.J., in the English journal, *The Month*, entitled, "Modern Society and Christian Religion: An Analysis of Social and Political Philosophy", I was reminded of a remark in Peter Brown's biography of Augustine:

Yet, as so often happens, this world on the edge of dissolution, had settled down to believe that it would last forever. The Jeremiahs of the declining Roman Empire will appear only in Augustine's old age; one cannot but be struck by the optimism of the men of Augustine's youth.³

What Valadier's analysis of the relation between the persistence of religion and modern philosophy missed, I think, is precisely this sense, found in Solzhenitsyn and Augustine, that religion's primary opponent would be a this-worldly politicized "faith" in which all of man's desires seemed to be met.

The real problem of religion and modern political philosophy is that religion itself has become largely absorbed into modern philosophy. As a result, it is more and more difficult to locate the meaning of "religion" in the classical sense. Significantly, the major interlocutors to this question are not to be found in theology but political philosophy, between those who do and those who do not think there is an opposition between classical and modern political philosophy.

But the problem with those who do recognize that classical political philosophy is in some sense necessary to prevent modern thought from being simply an ideology is that they do not recognize the unique place of a revelation addressed to intelligence. Since religion itself has ceased effectively to make this position because of its own relation to the ideological outcomes of modern thought, they can largely be excused on this point.

Religion, if it survives as ideology, that is, as an expression of what Leo Strauss called the "modern project", leaves us still with the problem of precisely "religion" as an openness to and reception of the transcendent. It is not enough, therefore, to notice that religion is somehow surviving in spite of modernity, according to which it should be disappearing. We must not sell modernity short, for it remains in some rudimentary sense the major temptation of Christians themselves unaware of the importance of the revival of classical political theory.

Yet, the irony of this is that the understanding and, in the best sense, continuation of the "progress" we so often attribute to "modernity" can only be saved by the rejection of that ideology of modernity that has become the direction of religion. The relation between the success of capitalism and the continued failure of socialism is a struggle within the understanding of modernity.

Here are allied, ultimately, not modern philosophy and material "progress", but rather progress and classical religion and philosophy over against, as Hannah Arendt has shown, the tyrannical regimes that have grown logically out of modern thought as such.⁴ Modern philosophy and those ideological currents in religion that seek to incorporate it are themselves theoretical constructs that impose a humanely conceived reformulation of the order of the world through a political philosophy without a sense of transcendent order.

This is why so many in the search of religion or God discover only despair. What they discover is modern ideology now disguised more or less as classical religion. What they discover is an ideology that has rejected the essential limits of the polis, which classical philosophy had long insisted was essential for a political and social life. Political philosophers like Strauss, Voegelin, and Arendt have observed that modern religion and the movements to which it is connected abandon the transcendent in favor of the ideological movements of modernity.

Thus, if there is indeed a problem existing between modern society and specifically Christian religion, it is not the problem classically formulated between Christianity's hostility to modernity and modernity understood as material progress. The problem is the growing similarity between

the imposed and existing expressions of modernity in the political order and Christianity's self-concept, which has now been detached from classical and biblical points of reference.

Political philosophy stands at the threshold of any understanding of what is happening in a religious environment that is rapidly politizing itself in terms of the intellectual models of modernity. Thus, the characteristic of modernity in political philosophy is to subsume transcendence into itself. This is why a return to classical political philosophy and its sense of moderation and limits is necessary for religion to grasp the implications of modernity. The observation of Leo Strauss in 1971 can be applied to Christianity, especially that type of Catholicism hostile to the pope in recent years :

Whoever is concerned with political philosophy must face the fact that in the last two generations political philosophy has lost its credibility. Political philosophy has lost its credibility in proportion as politics has become more philosophic than ever in a sense.⁵

The death of political philosophy about which Strauss was concerned was the result of the modernity out of which modern ideology arose.

When religion attempts to identify itself with modernity, it becomes a tool of the very force that seeks to replace it. Strauss was right. The first step, even for religion, is a return to political philosophy : that is, the philosophy rooted in Thucydides, Plato, and Aristotle. In denying this fact, today's Christian political thought has lost contact with transcendence. It has also abandoned the belief in natural reason that enabled it in the first place to talk to the Jews and Gentiles, and yes, even to moderns.

NOTES

1. *National Catholic Register*, January 5, 1986, 5.

2. Alexander Solzhenitsyn "Harvard Address", *Solzhenitsyn at Harvard*, edited by Ronald Berman (Washington: Ethics and Public Policy Center, 1980), 19.

3. Peter Brown, *Augustine of Hippo* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969), 25. See Paul Valadier's "Modern Society and Christian Religion", *The Month*, February 1986, 53-59.

4. Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Anchor, 1959); *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (New York: Meridian, 1969). See also Eric Vogelín *From Enlightenment to Revolution* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1975).

5. Leo Strauss, "Philosophy as a Rigorous Science and Political Philosophy", in *Studies in Platonic Political Philosophy*, edited by Thomas Pangel (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), 29.

This study was prepared at the request of Victor Kulanday, Life President of the All-India Laity Congress, for presentations at the latter's 1986 Convention in Bombay. Acknowledgements to *The Remnant*.

The Increasingly Imminent Menace of Communism

HAMISH FRASER

THE most authoritative definition of Communism is that of Pope Pius XI who declared nearly 50 years ago, in *Divini Redemptoris* (1937):

"Venerable Brethren, see that the faithful are put on their guard . . . Communism is intrinsically evil, and therefore no one who desires to save Christian civilization from extinction should render it assistance in any enterprise whatever. Those who allow themselves to be duped and who connive at the establishment of communism in their own countries will be the first to pay the penalty of their blunder; and the more ancient, the more flourishing the Christian civilization happens to be in any country which communism succeeds in penetrating, the more devastating will be their atheistic fury therein".

This definition is authoritative not only because it was a re-statement of the consistent teaching of the Pontifical Magisterium¹, but also because it has been corroborated so terrifyingly in the half-century since *Divina Redemptoris* was published.

When that encyclical letter on Communism was written, the mock trials to liquidate such Old Bolsheviks as had contrived to survive until then had yet to be completed. It is true that the Kulaks — i.e. independent farmers of the Ukraine — had already been liquidated, as Stalin himself subsequently admitted, at a cost in blood and treasure greater even than that of World War II — with somewhere between 5-10 million dead as a consequence of a deliber-

ately contrived famine, over and above those who had already been butchered or sent to the Gulag.

These and the other innumerable crimes of the Stalin era had yet to be publicly admitted by Khrushchev, who had himself played a prominent role as "Hangman of the Ukraine". (In effect Khrushchev's admissions constituted a subtle means whereby all of Communism's crimes were imputed to Stalin as a means of exculpating the post-Stalin Soviet Regime.)

When *Divini Redemptoris* was published, Soviet Russia's war crimes — including the massacre of Polish officers in Katyn Forest, not to speak of the later massacre of prisoners of war criminally returned to Stalin's mercy with the complicity of the Allies — had yet to be admitted. Eastern Europe had yet to be incorporated within the Soviet Empire; China also had yet to be taken over by Mao's no less brutal form of Revolutionary Marxist dictatorship; and South-East Asia's Calvary, too, had yet to begin. When *Divini Redemptoris* was written Communism ruled only one-sixth of the world's people. To day the proportion is nearer to one in three. And Moscow's imperialist thrust continues in all key areas of the globe: the Philippines, South Africa, Central and Latin America. Today, moreover, in the wake of the 1962 Rome-Moscow Agreement, the very Church of Christ has been infiltrated and largely occupied by ecclesial proponents of a liberation theology that is simply Revolutionary Marxism in a Christian guise, and, as a consequence, the institutional Church is becoming increasingly integral to the Revolution. In other words, today we are witnessing before our eyes the implementation of the warning of Our Lady of Fatima as well as that of *Divini Redemptoris*.

Not Spontaneous

There could be no greater mistake than to imagine that this infiltration and occupation of Mother Church — as also of other ecclesial communities — derives from spontaneity. It is true that there have always been wayward Christians, more inclined to think with the mind of the world than with the mind of the Church: i.e. with the mind of Socialism/Communism. What is different about the

present situation is the extent to which such tendencies have been sedulously cultivated and exploited to serve the purposes of the Revolution, by its *apparatchiks* and also by its highly organised fellow-travellers.

1917 - 1941

As from 1917 onwards, while Communism was implacably hostile to religion in any shape or form, it was always prepared to welcome such clergy, Catholic or Protestant, as were prepared to do the will of the Party of the Revolution. However, its efforts in recruiting Christians were exceedingly amateurish in the period prior to World War II. Even so, it succeeded in attracting a number of Christian fellow-travellers, but up till the Nazi invasion of the USSR in 1941 these were almost exclusively non-Catholics. The organised recruitment of Orthodox and Catholic Christians — and subsequently of masses of Protestants too — began with a vengeance in the wake of the German invasion of Soviet Russia.

Establishment of the Orthodox Church

When the Red Army virtually collapsed in the Ukraine in the summer of 1941, this resulted in a quite unprecedented surrender to the German invader on the part of both the Red Army and the local population, who mistakenly imagined the German invaders had come as liberators and welcomed them with the traditional bread and salt of Urkainian hospitality. Being nothing if not a realist, Stalin became only too well aware that ordinary folk could not possibly be roused to defend the Soviet slave empire. Therefore the call went forth to defend Mother Russia and, to make it all the more convincing, a Mother Russia wherein the Orthodox Church appeared to have been given a vital role in sustaining the war effort.

Under the NKVD

Towards this end, a Council for the Affairs of the Orthodox Church was established under the control of the NKVD — later to become the KGB — in order to ensure that the newly re-established Orthodox Church could be effectively disciplined and controlled as part of the Soviet Establishment, and also to ensure that none of its spokesmen would

issue any statement or engage in any propaganda that did not serve Stalin's purposes.

Simultaneously, efforts were made to develop relations with such Catholic Churchmen as appeared to be so inclined. However, success in the latter direction was very limited.

The Post-War Period

In the post-war period, however, while, on the one hand, the newly re-established Orthodox Church was subject to renewed persecution under Khrushchev; simultaneously, the main thrust of its activities was increasingly directed towards the subversion of Western ecclesial bodies — in particular the increasingly syncretist World Council of Churches.

However, with the occupation of Poland and its incorporation within the Soviet Empire, Moscow's attention also became increasingly directed towards the subversion of the Catholic Church.

The Pax Organisation

Towards that end, under the leadership of the former Polish pro-Nazi, Boleslaw Piasecki, the Pax organisation was established. However, given the unity of the immense majority of the Polish Catholic clergy and laity under Cardinal Wyszynski, Pax soon found that its subversive efforts within Poland were largely futile. However, this made Pax all the more determined to become a means of subverting the Catholic Church in Western Europe, and particularly in France where the institutional Church had already been largely taken over by anti-anti-Communists by the mid-50's, and where the "progressive" Review *Informations Catholiques Internationales* proved to be a most pliant instrument at Pax's disposal².

1956: Emergence of the CPC

However, it was not until 1958 that the Soviet manipulation of religion for political purposes became a major factor in the ecclesial equation. This became possible with the establishment in Prague of the Soviet-controlled Christian Peace Conference (CPC), a body analogous to the already

cited Council for the Affairs of the Orthodox Church, and no less obedient to Moscow's diktat.

This is to be seen in the fact that all CPC members slavishly follow whatever happens to be the Soviet "Party Line". This does not necessarily mean that all CPC members are card-carrying members of the Communist Party, although a certain proportion of them undoubtedly are. The others are nonetheless willing "fellow-travellers" who, for one reason or another, consistently do Moscow's bidding. Indeed, where such "fellow-travellers" are not members of the Party, or convincingly appear not to be, they are all the more effective insofar as, on all important issues, they do precisely what the CPC wants of them, while appearing to be sincere and disinterested peace lovers.

What is particularly significant and frightening is the extent to which all Western ecclesial bodies, not excluding even the Catholic Church, have been influenced by the CPC-directed Soviet peace offensive.

The Pastoral Development Group

At local level, this has been made possible by the concentrated, planned initiatives of hard-core Revolutionary Marxists — in the UK by cadres formerly of Slant, the December Group and the UK IDO-C organisation which latter body eventually merged and became integral to the Pastoral Development Group³.

Soon after the merger, the PDG launched an initiative which successfully persuaded the Hierarchy of England and Wales to convene a conference which led to the establishment of the National Conference of Priests (England and Wales) which from its inception was essentially progressive. The PDG thus brought into being a broad clerical stream in which its subversive fish could swim invisibly.

This Pastoral Development Group is now integral to the Catholic establishment in England and Wales and is listed as such in the official *Catholic Directory*. Its Chairman, Dr. Oliver Pratt⁴ is an old IDO-C-PDG associate. He and his wife Ianthe are indeed so well thought of by the Hierarchy that they were commissioned to write *Becoming the Easter People*⁵ which was designed to instruct the faithful concerning the implementation of the decisions of the 1980 National Pastoral Congress.

Nor was it by any means accidental or coincidental that the Pratts were given this task. It was natural that they should have been chosen, given the prominent role played by them and other PDG cadres in the organisation of the National Pastoral Congress.

Synod 1987 on the Laity

Since then, the influence of the *Pastoral Development Group* has become even greater⁶. Particularly significant is the extent to which the Pastoral Development Group's *Contribution to the Constitution on the Synod on the Laity*⁷ is similar in tone to *Synod 87 — Summary of the Consultation: Called to Serve* pack (issued by Consultation on the Laity, 39 Eccleston Square, London SW1V 1PD); no less horizontalist than was *The Easter People*, the evaluation of the 1980 National Pastoral Congress by the Hierarchy of England and Wales. Significantly, *The Easter People* made no mention of either Heaven or Hell. Nor, needless to say, did it indicate anywhere that the Church is the One True Church, the Ark of Salvation for all men, outside of which there is no salvation⁸.

In other words, those who drafted *Called to Serve* and also *Synod 87* are on precisely the same ideological wavelength as those who organised the 1980 National Pastoral Congress. In short, it would seem to indicate that it is folk in the PDG camp who are again playing a dominant role concerning preparations for the UK contribution to the 1987 Synod on the Laity. And since this Synod will be presided over by Cardinal Pironio, who is reputed to be an enthusiastic proponent of liberation theology, it is unlikely, even at best, to be more than a farce. Indeed, unless there is top-level intervention to clip the wings of the liberationists, at lay and clerical level, the 1987 Synod is much more likely to prove yet another step towards the subversion of the universal Church.

Christian Peace Conference Influence in the World

To appraise the CPC objectively it is necessary to see it in the Soviet context to which it belongs. As Julian Lewis has pointed out, in the January 1985 issue of *The Salisbury Review*:

"The CPC is the youngest member of a network of 13 major international propaganda front bodies co-ordin-

ated and controlled by the International Department of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party. Its most famous sister-organisation in this network is the World Peace Council (WPC), the President of which — an Indian Communist by the name of Romesh Chandra — has set down its view that the Soviet Union invariably supports the peace movement and that wherever people are fighting [sic] for peace and a new life, the Soviet Union is invariably standing by their side”

“The Christian Peace Conference and the World Peace Council have always been closely linked. The first CPC President, Joseph Hromadka, was a WPC member as well as a holder of the Lenin Peace Prize — a singular distinction for a theologian when Lenin’s views on religion are recalled”.

The essential purpose of the above network of Soviet-controlled front organisations is to agitate and obtain support for the objectives of Soviet foreign policy, and to blaze psychological trails for the advancement of Soviet imperialism by undermining and overcoming internal resistance within whichever countries these fronts operate; and more specifically, to recruit agents and fellow-travellers in support of the Soviet Party Line within Western political parties, trade unions, professional and cultural associations as well as within the various churches—the ecclesial sphere being, however, the preserve of the CPC.

In the international sphere the CPC describes itself in an official hand-out as “an official non-Governmental Organisation (NGO) of the United Nations, with a desk at the UN headquarters in New York.

“The CPC has joint consultations with the World Council of Churches and prepares special papers for some of its meetings”

In fact there is no ecclesial pie anywhere in the world in which it does not have one or more fingers⁹.

CPC Influence in the UK

The same CPC handout informs us that:

“The British Regional Committee [of the CPC] plays its part internationally and nationally

"At home, the Regional Committee is affiliated to Christian Organisations for Social, Political and Economic Change (COSPEC) and helped to organise the Christians Mobilise for Peace Conference at Birmingham University in 1982. Among those for whom meetings and sermons have been arranged in this country are the Revd. Christie Rosa of Sri Lanka, the CPC Deputy General Secretary and Secretary of the Asian CPC; Bishop Paulos Gregorios, a CPC Vice-President of the Orthodox Church of South India; Bishop Ferencz of Hungary; Pastor Zehrer of East Germany; Pastor Kamceta of Namibia; Prof. Dr. Bassarak of the GDR.

"Joint consultations and conferences have been held with Coventry Cathedral on such themes as 'Towards a New International Economic Order' and 'Disarmament and Development' and with various other bodies, e.g. with the African Methodist Episcopal Church in Britain on 'Race, Community and Church'. We are affiliated to the BCC's "Peace Forum". Specific British CPC events are also arranged on an occasional basis on such issues as East-West and North-South Relations, Peace and Disarmament, Inter-Racial and Inter-Faith Relations, with an emphasis on their interdependence. Enquiries about speakers on these themes are welcomed.

Thus, just as, internationally, the CPC operates through the *World Council of Churches*, so, nationally it operates through the *British Council of Churches* and also through COSPEC.

Cospec

According to David Clark, author of *The Liberation of the Church*¹⁰ and Honorary Director of the National Centre for Christian Communities and Networks (NACCAN): "In 1980, COSPEC came into existence as a left-wing loose-knit federation of some twenty groups embracing Christian Action, Christians Against Racism and Fascism, Christian Feminist Groups (London), the Student Christian Movement and the Urban Theology Unit (Sheffield)".

COSPEC's aim [according to Clark] was "co-operating in the struggle for a just, participatory and sustainable

society of necessity involving a break with the existing social, political and economic order”¹¹.

In short, being essentially anti-capitalist, and therefore, on the side of the Revolution, COSPEC is an ideal milieu within which CPC cadres can operate more or less invisibly¹².

NACCAN

However, the same can also be said of NACCAN itself. For it is intrinsically and invincibly on the side of the Revolution, being as Clark states “an independent charity and resources centre for the basic Christian community movement throughout the UK”¹³. It is no less clear that the basic objective of NACCAN is the achievement of what Clark repeatedly refers to as “autonomy and oecumenicity”, which would seem to be euphemistic synonyms for “moral permissiveness and syncretism”¹⁴, and a “Christianity” that has been completely de-supernaturalised and transposed into the key of naturalism, or to use Clark’s own language “earthed”, and, like the 1980 National Pastoral Congress, with no visible supernatural dimension.

Catholics in NACCAN

What is particularly alarming about NACCAN, in addition to the openly declared horizontalism of its Honorary Director who is also editor of NACCAN’s house organ *Community*¹⁵ is the number of Catholic religious orders and organisations which have volunteered to be registered in the Second Edition (1984) of NACCAN’s *Directory of Christian Groups, Communities and Networks*.

The 1984 edition of this *Directory* includes some 132 religious orders, 42 of them Anglican and 90 Roman Catholic, in addition to various Catholic lay organisations¹⁶. However, taking the religious orders alone, nearly one-third of all Catholic religious orders subscribe to NACCAN and this despite the essentially subversive, militantly anti-dogmatic stance of its Honorary Director, David Clark.

(To be Continued)

Liberation of all people from every form of oppression is not going to be achieved in the immediate future, but it should be recognized, clearly understood and sought by all as one of the important human goods.

As in other areas of life, great harm can be caused by error or lack of knowledge. In particular, liberation should not be thought of as leading any people to *absolute* independence. Acknowledgements to our Australian contemporary, *Social Order*.

The Vatican Instruction on Liberation : 3

W. G. SMITH, S.J.

IN its second chapter, the Vatican *Instruction* turns its attention to the human vocation to freedom, beginning with a study of the meaning of the word "freedom". It states that the "spontaneous" answer to the question "What does being free mean?", is that "a person is free when he is able to do whatever he wishes without being hindered by an exterior constraint and thus enjoys complete independence".

PROPER LIMITS

However, like many other spontaneous replies, this statement goes too far. In fact, *it is not possible* for people to be *completely independent* of one another, let alone free from *all* exterior constraint, able to be completely free to do *whatever* they want to do. For instance, some limits to human freedom are imposed by the deficiencies of human nature itself: thus, we are not physically capable of working or playing incessantly and at the same pace for days on end; we cannot achieve many physical goals without the assistance of machinery and/or of other people; we cannot even express our thoughts to some people without the help of an interpreter; and so on.

Then too, in addition to these limits imposed on all of us by the limitations of our own nature, there are limits quite rightly imposed on us by other people. We cannot do what we like to some of these, or take what we like from them, because they have the strength and fortitude to stop us, or because there are others who will help them do this, or do it for them.

In fact, the recognition of our limitations and of what is good or bad for our bodies, our minds, our emotions and our souls is so important for us that, as the *Instruction* points out, "under pain of destroying himself, man must learn to harmonize his will with his nature". Although we have been given the task of exercising dominion over the world, and of searching out and using the potentialities that have been built into it, we cannot do just what we like with them, as we have found to our cost countless times. The disaster at Chernobyl was a recent case where this rule was violated.

SOCIAL BEINGS

Furthermore, we are of such a kind that our origin, our survival and our adequate human development depend on the cooperative activity of other people. In other words, we are designed to live *social* lives, to be at our best when we are living and working in close and ordered cooperation with others in a pattern that is in "harmony with the exigencies of human nature" and seeks to gain "true good" for all. Respect for truth about ourselves and the rest of creation, and respect for the needs and rights of others, true justice, reveal not only the wide extent of our freedom, but also its proper limits. The *Instruction* warns:

"By discarding this foundation and taking himself for God, man falls into deception and, instead of realizing himself, he destroys himself. Far from being achieved in an absence of relationships and total self-sufficiency, freedom only truly exists where reciprocal bonds, governed by truth and justice, link people to one another".

The recognition and acceptance of these truths by anyone who seeks to liberate the oppressed is clearly important. True freedom is shown in the free doing of human good, and true liberation is the freeing of captive people by

methods that are in conformity with truth and justice and the demands of human nature. The captives, in their turn, are set free so that they may, by their own initiative and under their own direction, freely seek human good for themselves and others.

Granted these truths, the most basic and necessary form of liberation is the freeing of the individual from the captivity we call sin, from the free choice of moral evil, of something which is contrary to the law of God, the law given to us in our human nature or by God's revelation. Unless we seek moral good and reject moral evil, both our individual lives and the societies we necessarily create so that we may live in a human way will be deformed and doomed to harm rather than help us.

SELF-DEVELOPMENT

A freely chosen effort to achieve a more and more perfect understanding of true human good and an ever more perfect expression of it in all the departments of our lives and relationships with others is the way to true human development and fulfilment. We cannot achieve this by doing just what we like doing regardless of the impact of what we do on others, or by acting on the assumption that we may choose *any* means to get what we want — e.g. that we may lie or bribe or slander or kill in order to achieve our chosen political or economic goals.

This free but properly directed movement towards true human good is, in fact, the means God calls us to use in order that we may become more and more like himself. We are made in his image and likeness, but this likeness to God is capable of ever more perfect realization, and the effort to bring about that ever more perfect realization is our divinely given vocation, something God calls each one of us to do, with his help, because it is for our true good, for both our individual good and for the common good of all.

It is only in this way that true human happiness is to be found. In exercising our freedom rightly, we have formed ourselves in God's likeness, and we share more and more in his peace and joy. By our free choice of the good, we have also become collaborators with God in the on-going work of Creation, for we have, with God's help, caused

ourselves to be what we have become, better human beings. It is still to God, our creator, that we owe our origin and the potentialities and purpose of our lives; but it is also true that, with him, we have created what we now are.

TEMPORAL LIBERATION

The Vatican *Instruction* also points out that this understanding of interior freedom helps us to see more clearly the true meaning of political and economic liberation: "it involves all the processes which aim at securing and guaranteeing the conditions needed for the exercise of an authentic human freedom". In other words, the process of temporal liberation does not *give* or *produce* interior human freedom, for this can rightly be said still to exist even under the extreme pressures of tyranny — as the victims of Nazi and communist brutality have often amply proved — but it does, if it is true liberation in the political and economic orders, provide the external conditions for the appropriate exercise of human freedom. If it does not do this, it is not liberation, but merely another form of oppression, of captivity.

True liberation should enable individuals to exercise free, good choices in the various necessary human communities — in the family first of all, and in recreational, cultural, professional and political communities also. There should therefore be no more regulation and compulsion than is absolutely necessary, since the primary mark of a good society — large or small — is that it provides the widest possible area of freedom for the making of free and responsible choices by individuals and social groups and *encourages and helps* such activity.

Useful aids to the recognition of this "widest possible area of freedom" are the lists of human rights and freedoms given in such documents as Pope John XXIII's encyclical *Peace on Earth* and the United Nations' *Declaration on Human Rights*. True enough, they are only lists, and some of the world's countries have a long way to go before being counted as free; but at least the main human rights are well known and published widely, and the lists serve as goals for, and challenges to, regimes where the exercise of the rights listed is still not permitted. They also

set limits to the watering down of rights in countries where they are in force.

DIVERSITY

One of the unexpected benefits of this fullest possible exercise of true human freedom is not dull uniformity, but the creation of a rich diversity of cultures and societies. God's nature is infinitely rich, and the free human effort to grow in the likeness of God brings out something of this richness. This is what makes national and international travel still so fascinating and rewarding despite the great deal of borrowing and imitation that goes on between the many human groups, societies, cultures and nations: everywhere one goes, the richness of God is caught and expressed in different and unexpected ways of doing even the simplest things. In fact where wide diversity of thought and expression is not found, liberation is needed. The one true exception to this is to be found in the area of religious doctrine, but even here strict uniformity should be restricted to full acceptance of the truths that God has revealed and full observance of laws that may be validly made as consequences of these truths, or to ensure that they will be handed on and believed by future generations.

Diversity is also found as an effect of freedom in the exercise of human dominion over the natural order. This comes about not merely because different peoples are at different stages of economic development, but also because they have solved the problems of harnessing and using the potentialities of creation in different ways. Thus, the methods used by the Japanese people to set up and carry on their massive industrial programs differ greatly from those in use in our own country; but there is not the slightest doubt that they have been very successful in producing goods and in promoting freedom for both workers and consumers at the same time.

Scientific and technological activity, therefore, are not to be our masters, but are to be subject to free and moral human choices.

Book Review

Women Priests and Other Fantasies by Rev. Vincent P. Miceli; Christopher Publishing House, 106 Longwater Drive, Norwell, Mass. 02061, USA; pp. 407; no price stated.

The reader should be made aware that the whole of Father Miceli's book is not devoted to the question of women priests. Those who might think that this was the case have probably been struck by the bold lettering of the book's title on its cover.

I think the second thing the reader should know is that the first thirty-seven pages of this book, devoted to the question of women priests, with additional pages treating of "Sisters as Symbols", is really excellent. The essentials of the argument against women priests are presented here against a background of really great erudition and with a poise that shows the Author as unflinching in his total loyalty to the Church. Most powerfully he shows that the Catholic Church, as divinely instituted by Christ, cannot depart from His clear directive that the Catholic Priesthood should be male. That, really, is the end of it, the tut-tut-tutting of the Progressive Establishment within the Catholic Church notwithstanding.

It is obviously quite different where a man-made Church, like the Anglican, is concerned. These Churches are likely enough to change in any manner of essentials, simply and solely because they are not God-designed. Hard words, but true. There is no reason, therefore, why Catholics should be interested in any parallel they may appear to present. There is even less when it comes to any comparison with the purely secular sphere. To argue that there is no reason why the Catholic Church should not have priestesses in its ranks in the same way that the police force has police-women, is to miss the whole point of the argument, which Father Miceli presents so ably and so well. The point is that there is no comparison between the two, for the simple reason that the Church was founded by God and the police force was not.

Father Miceli's splendid publication of 407 pages covers a whole variety of subjects collected, so to say, under three heads — Dogma, Morals and Philosophy. In all three, the writing is incisive and set well within a fine framework of Catholic principles and values; understandable and easy to read precisely on account of that. The way to treat this excellent work, it seems to me, is to regard it essentially as a work of reference. So regarded, it will prove of enormous help to those who are looking for a true background of Catholic values and principles against which to set their own reflections on the events which are overtaking the Church, society and the world today. In short, the shape-up and size—above all, the incisiveness—of this splendid book call out for its reflective study by those who have at heart in these appallingly confused times the true interests of the Church they love.

—Paul Crane, S.J.

PLEASE NOTE

That any book mentioned in this or other issues of *Christian Order* is obtainable from:

Holy Cross Catholic Bookshop,
4, Brownhill Road,
London SE26 2FJ: UK.

and

Carmel of Plymouth,
1 Grenville Road,
St. Jude's,
Plymouth: UK.